FBIS DAILY REPORT CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 045 9 March 1987

USSR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

'Top Priority' Program on Gorbachev Proposal AA 1
[Bogdanov, Plekhanov, (Sheer) Pozner]
Kondrashov: ABM Treaty Reagan's 'Last Hurrah' AA 6
[IZVESTIYA 15 Feb]

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

Weekly 'International Observers Roundtable' CC 1
[Agayants, Kornilov, Dmitriyev]

UNITED STATES & CANADA

Reagan Radio Address on 'Shifts' in Relations A 1
Further Report A 1
Comment Continues on Reagan's 'Irangate' Speech A 1
Biryukov: 'Perplexing' Speech A 1
Kolesnichenko: 'Not Over Yet' [PRAVDA 6 Mar] A 2
Pogodin on 'Unanswered Questions' A 3
U.S. Trying to Distract Attention From 'Irangate' A 4
[Kornilov]
Shultz To Make Return Visit to Soviet Union A 5
Baker Asks Koehler To Resign After 1 Week A 5
Timerbayev on 'Hostile' Environment at UN A 5

SOUTHEAST ASIA & PACIFIC

Further on Shevardnadze Visit to Indonesia E 1
Talks With Mokhtar E 1
Further on Talks E 1
Mokhtar Speaks at Dinner E 2
Shevardnadze Responds [IZVESTIYA 8 Mar] E 2

WESTERN EUROPE

Iceland's Hermannsson Makes Official Moscow Visit G 1
Welcomed at Airport G 1
Meets With Gorbachev [PRAVDA 4 Mar] G 1
Comments on Gorbachev Meeting [AFP] G 3
Exchanges Views With Ryzhkov [PRAVDA 4 Mar] G 4
Ryzhkov Dinner Speech [PRAVDA 4 Mar] G 5
Hermannsson Dinner Address [PRAVDA 4 Mar] G 7
News Conference 3 Mar G 10

'Completely Satisfied' With Talks [IZVESTIYA 4 Mar] G 11
Raisa Gorbachev Hosts Lunch G 11
Seen off at Airport [PRAVDA 5 Mar] G 11
Copenhagen News Conference G 12
IZVESTIYA Decries Turkish Human Rights Abuses [Leonidov, 2 Mar] G 12

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

Peres' Request To Visit Moscow 'Rejected' H 1
[Kuwait KUNA]
Economic Cooperation Protocol Signed With Syria H 1
Envoy Received by Syrian Vice President H 2
Cultural Cooperation Plan Signed With Iraq H 2
[IZVESTIYA 6 Mar]
IZVESTIYA Reports Cairo Gulf War Seminar H 3
[Skosyrev 27 Feb]

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

Reportage on Ethiopian Defense Minister's Visit J 1
Arrives, Meets With Sokolov J 1
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 3 Mar]
Holds Talks With Aliyev J 2
Ends Visit, Departs 9 Mar J 2

LATIN AMERICA & CARIBBEAN

Further Reportage on Yeltsin in Nicaragua, Cuba K 1
Meets Castro; Departs Cuba [Havana] K 1
Yakovlev Meets Yeltsin K 1
IZVESTIYA on Matagalpa Visit [5 Mar] K 1
Nicaragua To Remain Active in Nonaligned Movement K 3
Havana Holds Exhibition on U.S. Role in Nicaragua K 4
[PRAVDA 26 Feb]

USSR NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

Zhukov Replaced as Peace Committee Chairman R 1
MVD Officer Discounts Claims of Youth Rampages R 1
[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 4 Mar]
Resolution Issued on State Arbitration Organs R 4
Benefits of Ministry Press Centers Disputed R 5
[Makhrin in PRAVDA 27 Feb]
NOVOSTI Commentators Note Impact of CPSU Congress R 5
[Mytarev, Beglov, Morozov in Bratislava PRAVDA 3 Mar]
Jewish Women Begin Hunger Strike for Emigration [AFP] R 8
2 French Families in Armenia To Get Exit Visas [AFP] R 8
Paper Rebuts Rumors of Leak at Chernobyl R 8
[Kraslyanskyy in RADYANSKA UKRAINA 28 Feb]
CPSU Control Body Censures Kazakh Academy Officials R 10
[PRAVDA 14 Feb]

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENTS

PRAVDA Views 'Ownership' in Economic Reform S 1
[Kulikov 27 Feb]
Nuclear-powered Icebreaker Under Construction S 6
[Belyayeva in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 28 Feb]

AGRICULTURAL AFFAIRS

Late February Weather, Crop Situation Reviewed T 1
[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 5 Mar]
Media Covers 5-7 March Agricultural Work T 1
Ukraine Takes Steps to Increase Grain Yields T 2
[PRAVDA UKRAINY 28 Feb]

SCIENTIFIC AFFAIRS

TASS Details Experiments on Mir Space Station U 1
[Ovcharov]

MILITARY DEVELOPMENTS

Sokolov Addresses Armed Forces Women's Aktiv V 1
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 1 Mar]
Marshal Shestopalov Attends Turkestan MD Meeting V 1
[Ivanov in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 6 Mar] V 1
General Shabanov Attends N. Caucasus MD Conference V 2
[Borovkov in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 3 Mar]

'TOP PRIORITY' PROGRAM ON GORBACHEV PROPOSAL

LD071525 Moscow in English to North America 0000 GMT 7 Mar 87

["Top priority" program with Dr Radomir Bogdanov and Dr Sergey Plekhanov of the United States of America and Canada Institute, Moscow; (Robert Scheer) of THE LOS ANGELES TIMES; presented by Vladimir Pozner]

[Excerpts] [Pozner] The topic today I think is evident, and that is the Soviet proposal on INF, or medium-range missiles in Europe, that is to say the dismantling, I would call it, of the package proposal that was made at Reykjavik, taking out the medium-range missiles as a separate issue and proposing to deal with that; to take out all Soviet medium-range missiles in Europe, all American medium-range missiles also, not to take into account the British and the French nuclear potential. And also there is something that has to do with medium-range missiles in Asia, that is bringing the Soviet number down to 100 warheads, which is the equivalent of 33 missiles, I believe. Let's look at this.

Some people are saying it's a major breakthrough. There seems to have been some very positive reaction to this. President Reagan has said some good words about it, which was on the air and on Soviet television. How do you feel about this thing? Is it, is it really something important that's happened? Can it lead somewhere? And let's look a little bit back; is there something behind it? Is it a continuation of Reykjavik in a way? Dr Bogdanov, you want to start?

[Bogdanov] Yes, Vladimir. Yes, I would like to start with two comments. I would prefer to talk a little bit on the new political thinking, because to my mind what is important in that INF business is just the expression of the new political thinking, because I feel that is a very close link between what we call a new political thinking and our decision to pick up INF out of the package and to go ahead with that.

[Pozner] Now why do you say that? Why do you call that new political thinking?

[Bogdanov] That's the point I would like to call your attention to.

[Pozner] Yes.

[Bogdanov] Because if we ask our friend from THE LOS ANGELES TIMES how he does undertstand the new...[Bodanov changes thought] He spent in the Soviet Union almost 2 weeks now, isn't it?

[(Scheer)] Three weeks.

[Bogdanov] Three weeks now, and I believe that he has some, you know, feeling on what is the new political thinking. Will he agree with my point that the very substantial major part of the new political thinking is flexibility, flexibility? If you feel that the environment has been changing, or you feel that you should take dramatic, unconventional, unusual, you know steps to move the whole thing, then you take a decision to do it very quickly, very fast, (?yet) you just adjust to the new (?in a way) what we have done (?by this). Do you agree with me?

[Pozner] (Robert Scheer), do you agree with this?

[(Sheer)] First of all I'm hoping that the new thinking is even more exciting than you suggest, which is not just flexibility but...

[Bogdanov interrupts] That's one of the parts of it, you know.

[(Scheer)] But rather a recognition that missiles do not bring security. And if I were to look at the old thinking I personally believe it was stupid to put the missiles into Europe in the first place. They didn't add to anybody's security, and now you have not only flexibility but a recognition that Soviet security is really not enhanced by having these missiles and by having Pershings on the other side. And hopefully on the West there'll be a recognition that the security of the West is not enhanced by these missiles.

The key element of the new thinking -- aside from flexibility and pragmatism which I do recognize is there -- I think it was bold to break up the package. It was a good idea. But it seems to me the really important idea is to get away from the idea that strength and security rests on bean-counting of missiles and having one or 200 or 300 more of this SS this or MX that or so forth, and that's what's bold about this.

[Pozner] Do you think that new thinking also means the ability to acknowledge past mistakes?

[(Scheer)] You know, I am obviously not the one to speak for the Soviet Government, but I've interviewed a number of high officials now in the last 3 weeks, and I must say they do exhibit a refreshing tendency to admit past mistakes. And I would say without exception they've all conceded that they really did not gain any measure of security by putting those missiles in in the first place, and that the world will be safer with fewer missiles in Europe. So yes, I would say the new thinking reflects a spirit of self-criticism which is admirable, and I hope it continues in this (?vein).

[Pozner] Dr Plekhanov, did you want to jump in here? And I still would like some answer to my initial question, and that is besides its being a reflection of new thinking and beside its being laudable, commendable and what have you, what I would also like to know is: Do you really believe this is going, this is an important step that could be the first major step along the way to what Reykjavik was initially all about?

[Plekhanov] Yes, certainly. I'm afraid that many Americans do not really fully understand how important this issue of medium-range missiles is. There is a tendency to think of them as something rather small, existing in Europe and really outside of the major concerns, as far as most Americans are concerned. So I would like to emphasize two things which make INF very important. Number one, they are highly accurate missiles located within in very, well, relatively short distances from their targets. Their flying time from the launch pad to the target is from 5-10 minutes. And in this current situation if there is an increase of tensions the likelihood of an unwanted nuclear war, something along the line of that Soviet movie which I think some Americans saw on their television screen -- I mean "Letters from a Dead Man" -- the likelihood of such a conflagration tremendously increases. So we were actually on a very, very slim hair-trigger with those missiles. So it is important to pull those missiles out of Europe and turn Europe into a safer place, and that would make the whole world a safer place. And the second point is if that package is successful, if we are able to reach agreement between the United States...

[Pozner interrupts] But that's not a package, that's a straightforward proposal. There are no other things attached to it, as far as I can judge.

[Plekhanov] That's right, that's right. But, well, I mean package because there are several elements in that proposal concerning the detail, the tactical missiles, (?the provision) is also there, so the important thing is that this is a real reduction. This would be a real reduction of weapons, some of the most dangerous weapons, first-strike weapons, the very edge of this, you know, this line of danger which has been growing recently. So I think that the issue is very important for Americans just as it is for the Soviets, not to mention the Western Europeans. [passage omitted]

[Bogdanov] Do you believe that this President at his present shape, or rather this Presidency, will be able to bring together all the factions within this administration really to reach an agreement on INF in Geneva? What is your feeling? I have my answer to this, but, of course, you are more expert-like.

[(Scheer)] This President can push through any arms control measure that he wants. He has certainly not to worry about his rightwing critics. He certainly has the credibility with the American public as far as not being soft on the Russians. And if he has the will he could make as far-reaching a compromise agreement with the Soviets as he desires. And I think there is enough time to get congressional support, because I think the support is there for arms control.

What I'm concerned about is I don't think that progress on intermediate-range forces will lead to the rest of the package because the stumbling block in the rest of the package is Star Wars, SDI. And I see no indication that President Reagan wants to compromise on Star Wars, or use it as a bargaining chip. If he's willing to use it as a bargaining chip it seems to me he could get quite a bargain at this time. But from my conversations here with Soviet officials they indicate no desire at all to compromise on offensive weapons if there will not be progress on Star Wars. So I think this is the stumbling block, and we ought not to be deluded that progress on the intermediate-range forces will lead to progress on major strategic weapons.

[Pozner] Let me pass this thought by all of you. I take your point, Mr (Scheer), but I'd like to ask you to look at this. If we take the Soviet-American relationship I think we would have to admit that never before -- even in 1972 when we signed some very important agreements -- never before has there actually been any physical cutback, real serious physical cutback in the sense of weapons. That has not happened. Now if this particular proposal on medium-range missiles is accepted, if both sides can work out an agreement, and if as a result of that the weapons that have been deployed are not only taken out of where they are now but are dismantled under international supervision, don't you think that as a kind of psychological setting, as a kind of atmosphere, that this has actually happened? It could lead to some very important steps, and I don't want you to say, or try to guess which, but that simply the fact of this happening could trigger a change in attitudes, of a very major importance. Does that sound logical, or does that sound like pie in the sky?

[(Scheer)] There is no question that you are right. I mean we need some successes here in the arms control area. And you're quite right also that the actual destruction of weapons instead of putting new limits and new ceilings which give you higher weapons would be a major achievement, so I'm not down-playing that. I think, however, to move to this second stage, which is to get rid of your strategic, or cut back your strategic forces, will require compromise on the whole question of defensive as well as offensive weapons, and I suspect that's going to wait for the next American Administration. I see no signs that President Reagan thinks Star Wars is a bargaining chip. I may be wrong.

But I think, barring such a shift in his position, I don't suspect that the Soviets are going to go for cuts in their offensive weapons, because what they've been saying over and over again is that they think more offensive weapons is the only way and the cheapest way to deal with the potential of Star Wars.

[Bogdanov] I tend to agree with Mr (Scheer). I do not believe that this administration and this President has [as heard] some other views than that they should go ahead with the Star Wars, and what worries me really, that they may use, you know, that one element of the package just to kill the other elements.

[Pozner] What other elements?

[Bogdanov] I mean strategic offensive and space and testing. And I'm afraid that they may impress so much the Congress by that deal that the Congress will stay idle, the Congress might get satisfied with that deal. So what worries me really, that what worries me.

[Plekhanov] In other words by yielding an inch you then are able to gain a foot.

[Bogdanov] Yes, I mean that.

[Pozner] I'd like you to clarify what you are saying here. I'm not quite clear on what you mean.

[Plekhanov] No, no, no, what I mean. But, as I understand Bogdanov, he's saying there is a possibility that the administration may think that by yielding on INF -- OK let's sign an agreement on INF, let's eliminate those missiles -- they will make their position even harder as far as the other weapons are concerned, strategic offensive weapons....

[Pozner interrupts] But we have to say, I mean we have to admit that the U.S. administration has said many times that it is prepared to deal on the INF situation, that in fact were the INF situation presented as a separate thing there would be no problem. I don't think we can talk about yielding in that sense. It would seem that this answers what the U.S. Government has been saying. Now maybe they weren't saying honestly, maybe they were, but the fact of the matter that they didn't ever. It's not a question of yielding at this point. I don't think so. What do you think?

[(Scheer)] No, no, yah. Let's back off from all of this excessive complexity. I mean it would be a good thing to get rid of these missiles, since I said they shouldn't have been put in in the first place by the Russians; they shouldn't have been put in by the Americans.

They don't make the world safer, they make it more dangerous. So it's good for humanity to get rid of these missiles. If nothing else is accomplished in what remains of the Reagan administration, that will be a significant accomplishment.

[Plekhanov] I agree.

[(Scheer)] It would be better yet if one could move from that confidence-building measure to broader agreement on strategic weapons. I'm pessimistic about that happening, but I suspect that success in this area of intermediate-range missiles will make it easier for a future administration to look for deep cuts in offensive weapons and to cut back on defensive programs. So I don't see this as a question of, as I understand, the original point, I don't see this as deluding the American public. I don't see it as a way of slipping out of arms control, because I think any confidence building, any success stories will be all to the good and will make it easier for a future administration to move in an even more serious way.

[Bogdanov] Basically I am in agreement with you, but as a student of American political life, as a scientist, you know, I'm trying to look a little bit deeper, trying to, you know, weigh all the elements of the equation, you know. But basically, I'm in agreement with you.

[Pozner] (?With) time running out, I'd like to have your final views on the following question. I'd like it to be a yes or no answer. Most people don't like that, especially scientists, but I'm still going to have to ask you to do that. Do you think that this proposal from the Soviet Union is going to get, is going to be embodied, is going to be achieved within a relatively short period of time? Do you see this as something that is going to be a factual advance in the area of arms reduction or not?

[Bogdanov] No doubt, yes.

[Pozner] Yes. What about you, Dr Plenkhanov?

[Plekhanov] Sixty to forty, yes.

[Pozner] All right. Mr (Scheer)?

[(Scheer)] I was told last night by a high Soviet official that there could be agreement in 2-3 months, and I think if the spirit is willing on the other side it should be concluded in such a time.

[Pozner] What I'm asking you is: Do you think it will be concluded?

[(Scheer)] I do think it will be concluded, because this is after all what the U.S. Government has been asking for. The Soviets have now basically conceded the position of the U.S. Government on this issue. Why shouldn't there be an agreement? Even the French seem to be coming along, and they love these weapons more than anyone for some obscure reason that I can't fathom.

[Pozner] Thank you very much. On that we end this issue of "Top Priority." Be with us a week from today at the same time for our next issue. Vladimir Pozner wishing you all goodbye and good listening.

KONDRASHOV: ABM TREATY REAGAN'S 'LAST HURRAH'

PM191633 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Feb 87 Morning Edition p 5

[Stanislav Kondrashov "Political Observer's Opinion": "The Last Hurrah?"]

[Text] Ronald Reagan celebrated his 76th birthday in Washington recently -- to the accompaniment of speculation, voiced aloud and muttered in whispers, about the President's health. On the subject of his health, some say: It is tremendous for someone his age, although the President is nevertheless working to a "limited schedule" after a recent minor operation. Others say: The President's hearing and powers of concentration are deteriorating, his mind wanders, and he is losing his energy. Both agree Reagan's political health has been fairly shaken as result of the unforeseen chronic illness called "Irangate." They are non in agreement in their suppositions as to whether his health will recover by the end of his presidency -- which is now quite close.

Another inevitable subject now is that of the President's legacy in domestic and foreign policy -- and we are primarily concerned with the latter. We hear Nancy Reagan is still going to great pains to ensure her spouse is viewed with gratitude by posterity as a venerated peacemaker. What is the value of this lady's vague hopes of veneration when the legacy question has been taken up with unprecedented zeal by Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger, who is backed by powerful forces, including the armed forces and the military-industrial complex? They too are looking beyond the Reagan Presidency and trying to boost and speed up the arms race to such an extent that even the President's immediate succdessor will not be able to stop the powerful inertia of the speed that will have been reached. It is with this aim in mind that an extensive operation is now under way in Washington to wipe out the 1972 ABM Treaty and thereby clear the way for the earliest possible phased deployment [razvertyvaniye] of the SDI program.

Let us move on to specific explanations. While a political battle is being waged over the "Star Wars" program, inside the Pentagon its exponents are working tirelessly under the leadership of General James Abrahamson. Persistent reports that the SDI program is progressing more successfully than expected have been coming out of the Pentagon in recent weeks. It is going to be possible to test combat systems in space earlier than expected and then, as long as the pace is maintained, in the first half of the nineties it will be time to deploy [razvertyvat] the first space-based stations capable of knocking out Soviet ICBM's during the boost stage. All this must be decided now -- whether to go inot space or not, whether to deploy [razvertyvat] or... Incidentally, this word "or" does not exist as far as Weinberger and his kindred spirits are concerned.

What does exist, however, is a certain international commitment made quite voluntarily by Washington -- the U.S.-USSR ABM Treaty, which prohibits this kind of test and this kind of deployment [razvertyvaniye]. As far as extreme militarists are concerned, this treaty now has the same effect as a straitjacket: "not to develop, test, or deploy ABM systems or components which are sea-based, air-based, space-based, or mobile land-based."

So, is the treaty to be observed or not? This word "or" counts for nothing in the eyes of those whose attitude has been formulated not very elegantly but certainly very accurately by one U.S. newspaper: "Spit on everything for the sake of SDI." It is therefore a question of how to do the spitting a little more diplomatically.

This is because a direct rejection of the treaty would be too provocative an action, fraught with unacceptable damage to the politically weakened administration both at home and abroad.

The method of adopting a so-called "broad" interpretation of the ABM Treaty has been chosen for the purpose of spitting more diplomatically. The idea of finding a loophole for getting out of the treaty, of its "broad" interpretation was put forward about 2 years ago by Abraham Sofaer, a legal consultant with the State Department, who delved into the stenographic records of U.S.-USSR talks. Sofar himself was not involved in drawing up the ABM Treaty. This fact helped the legal consultant to turn the treaty upside down with the claim that its prohibitions do not extend to ABM systems based on physical principles not referred to in the text -- lasers and particle beam weapons, for example.

The ABM Treaty is basically being very cynically turned into an ABM anti-treaty. Or -- just as bad -- into an anti-ABM Treaty. Meanwhile, after the aforementioned research President Reagan approved the "broad" interpretation in principle in October 1985. But, not wishing to cause unnecessary, premature irritation, he gave instructions at the time to stay (for the meantime!) with the "narrow" interpretation. The "broad" interpretation was thereby kept on ice until such time as it would be required by the next stage in the SDI program. That time has now come.

A council chaired by the President met in the White House on 3 February to discuss the next step with SDI. Three days later the ultraconservative WASHINGTON TIMES newspaper, which stands high in the administration's favor, published the session's minutes -- obtained, it said, "through legitimate channels."

Since White House sources have actually confirmed the authenticity of the minutes, we publish the following extracts:

Weinberger: Do we want deployment [razvertyvaniye]? It is quite clear this question must be answered in the affirmative. We do not as yet have anything comprehensive, but we should deploy [razvernut] the individual elements which would become part of the general system.

Carlucci, national security adviser to the President: Partial deployment [razvertyvaniye] is the right answer in both military and strategic respects. What can be said about it from a political standpoint?

Admiral Crowe, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff: The Joint Chiefs of Staff support SDI and its phased deployment. However, we do not as yet have sufficient grounds for making a decision.

Weinberger: But we have to make certain decisions now.

Secretary of State Shultz: Making any decision would be inappropriate at present.

Weinberger: We have made great progress in the development [razrabotka] of weapons using kinetic energy to knock out missiles in the boost phase. Do we intend to deploy the system gradually or immediately? Let us deploy 60 of these weapons, which would allow us to knock out 2,000 warheads. We can conduct tests to knock out missiles using the Delta-181 missile. If the tests are successful we could deploy by 1993.

Shultz: General Abrahamson believes this can be done by 1993. Others are more skeptical. Let us add another couple of years to that date.

Weinberger: The question is whether to deploy the system gradually and begin broadly interpreting the ABM Treaty. Then we could begin deploying lasers, particle beam weapons, and so forth. But we need a specific program.... We need a phased deployment because it cannot all be done at once.

Reagan: It would be interesting to see how the Soviet Union reacts to this.

Shultz: It is hard to say how the Soviets will act.... The problem with deployment even in 1993 is that some of the tests (Delta-181) require a broad interpretation of the ABM Treaty.

Weinberger: The Soviets have their own agenda.... They want to ban something. We should not argue with the Soviets over what can and what cannot be banned.

Shultz: We must see what we can find out and whether we can find this out in particular, and then hold talks with the Soviet Union.

Reagan: Don't ask the Russians. Tell them: The United States could begin deployment. I will say that I have reappraised the situation. I am aware what this is going to cost us and am prepared to pay....

These were the opinions exchanged. Shultz' timid opposition was broken down once again. The President was capable enough of confirming his hostility to the ABM Treaty and taking Weinberger's side. His key words were: Don't ask the Russians. I am prepared to pay....

The President is ready to cast off the ABM Treaty, and this is in line with his credo of disarmament through superarmament. But, thank goodness, others are not prepared either to bid farewell to the treaty or to share the President's credo. Outside the White House this new enterprise has met with strong opposition. Objections -- in the form of confidential letters to Washington or through other channels -- have been voiced by Canadian Foreign Minister Clark, FRG Chancellor Kohl, Italian Prime Minister Craxi, NATO Secretary General Lord Carrington, British Foreign Secretary Howe, and also British Prime Minister Thatcher who, incidentally, had previously been assured that the White House would respect the ABM Treaty. The allies, of course, have become used to U.S. hegemony, but in this case they simply cannot explain Washington's dangerous caprice to their peoples.

Nevertheless, the extent of their influence on the Reagan administration should not be exaggerated. More important is the stand taken by the U.S. Congress, where all the key positions are held by Democrats. If they oppose the Republican administration in foreign policy, they come from the left and not from the right, for all the arbitrariness of those terms. New Speaker Jim Wright, House Democratic Majority Leader Thomas Foley, and others sent the President a letter pointing out that the earliest possible creation [sozdaniye] and deployment [razvertyvaniye] of ABM elements is not in the interests of U.S. national security and "could wipe out our chances" of reaching an arms control agreement with the Soviet Union.

The most weighty opposition to a "broad" interpretation has been formulated in another letter to the President -- from Democratic Senator Sam Nunn, chairman of the influential Armed Services Committee. He singled out three points in particular. First, 15 years ago, when the Senate ratified the ABM Treaty, it proceeded not from the interpretation toward which the administration is now inclining but from the interpretation proposed by the treaty itself. In view of this, the administration's behaviour would cause, second, "serous constitutional confrontation" with Congress. Third, the new interpretation of the treaty would mean, as the senator pointed out to the President, "the end of arms control under your administration."

The administration has also been sharply criticized in the "big press" on the U.S. east coast. The state of affairs has been portrayed most strikingly of all by NEWSDAY, published in Long Island, New York.

"There is no doubt as to what is happening," it says in an editorial. "A group of people who want to scrap the arms control process are trying to use the political vacuum created as a result of the Iran-Nicaragua scandal. They are led by Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger and by Richard Perle, his chief adviser in the arms sphere, sometimes known as the 'Prince of Darkness.'

"President Reagan," NEWSDAY continues, "obviously believes he can disregard previous treaties and conclude an arms control agreement nevertheless... Anyone, however, who understands USSR-U.S. relations comprehends the situation better than he does. No agreement will be reached under the present administration or even, possibly, in the years to come if Perle is allowed to fill the vacuum with his extremist ideas."

A justified warning.

On the whole, the friendly rebuff from the Capitol Hill end of Washington's Pennsylvania Avenue and the European side of the Atlantic has had an effect, for today at least. The White House has backed down a little -- Secretary of State Shultz is assuring the press and the public that no decision has been taken and that it will not be taken for weeks and months yet -- and then only after close consultations with Congress and the allies.

...When a veteran fighter is going into the attack for the last time in his life, in America that is called the last hurrah. The expression has migrated from military to political vocabulary. Reagan's election publicity marathon last fall on behalf of the conservative Republican candidates for Congress was christened "the last hurrah." That attack misfired: The Democrats took Capitol Hill and both chambers of Cngress. Are we nowe hearing Reagan's last hurrah in the arms control sphere? Having failed to conclude a single agreement with the Soviet Union and throwing the SALT-II treaty to the winds, the President's army is now attacking the last of the agreements left to the present master of the White House by his predecessors.

The new attack launched in the twilight of the Reagan administration by various "princes of darkness" can -- and must -- fail, because in one way or another common sense in America is growing stronger. What a strange and sorry sight! What a combination of destructive reflexes and shortsightedness, which has prevented the administration from seizing a truly historic opportunity!

President Reagan has a partner -- the Soviet Union, which is showing more willingness than ever to achieve a realistic agreement on a sharp reduction in nuclear weapons. He has allies who are ready to support this kind of agreement, which takes their interests into account. He has Congress which, with the present arrangement of forces, will cooperate in this historic task, giving voice to the American people's indisputable desire for pace. The halo of peacemaker would appear to be within easy reach -- not a bad way out, incidentally, of the paralysis caused by "Irangate." There it is, the path of fruitful cooperation, on which the presidency's political strength could be preserved rather than lost in the time it has left. In actual fact, however, despite everything, instead of statemanship we are still witnessing something akin to reckles imperial folly -- in both the broad and the narrow interpretations of the word.

WEEKLY 'INTERNATIONAL OBSERVERS ROUNDTABLE'

LD082009 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1230 GMT 8 Mar 87

["International Observers Roundtable" program, conducted by Nikolay Agayants, with TASS political observer Yuriy Kornilov, and international affairs journalist and Doctor of Sciences Boris Dmitriyev]

[Text] [Agayants] Hello, comrades. The 1st week of March has now ended and receded into the past. According to the calendar, spring is already here, but outside it is freezing, with snowstorms and snowdrifts. On no account does winter want to give up its position, although the approach of fine weather is something unavoidable. This is a question of time in nature. As regards politics unfortunately, the approach of a genuine warm spell in international relations is still a long way off. There are forces in the world that would like to turn history back to the infamous times of the Cold War, forces which are piling up all sorts of barriers and obstacles on the path of resolving the most important problems of modern times, on the path of the triumph of the new thinking and new approaches. The past week was rich in events of the most varied scale and significance, events which have literally concentrated the attention of the world's public on the two courses in foreign policy: The course of the USSR and other socialist states aimed at lowering tension, curbing the arms race, and cooperation and trust; and the course that is in many ways contradictory and inconsistent, held by the United States and its allies.

Unquestionably the main theme of the foreign mass information media all this week has been the USSR's new peace initiative set forth in the statement by the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee of 28 February. In everyone's appraisal it is a decision of cardinal importance, the aim of which is to undertake in a condensed space of time a real step toward totally liberating Europe from nuclear weapons. I will recall that our proposals envisage the immediate conclusion of a separate agreement on the total elimination of medium-range missiles on the European continent and their sharp reduction down to 100 warheads in the Asian part of the USSR and on U.S. national territory. In other words, we have agreed to isolate the given problem from the block of issues under examination at the Geneva talks.

[Dmitriyev] It would seem that after Reykjavik, everything was tied up in such knots that it was only possible to undo them simultaneously, but the Soviet leadership heeded the anxiety and hopes being uttered in many European countries. Let nobody now say that a great power is going back on its word. On the contrary, it is promoting it beyond the limit that others are unable to overcome because of the stagnation of their political thinking. What is the issue, specifically? If an agreement is concluded on the total elimination of the USSR and U.S. medium-range missiles deployed in Europe, then on the Soviet side, 243 SS-20 missiles will be dismantled. Insofar as we are advocating that the missiles should be totally dismantled, it means that there will be no other medium-range missiles in Europe, neither from the USSR or from the United States. In Asia the SS-20 missiles will be reduced to such a number that there will be not more than 100 warheads on them.

Now, about the Americans. The agreement will require that all U.S. Pershing-2 and cruise missiles currently deployed in Europe be totally dismantled. According to Western data to date, it is a question of eliminating a total of 316 missiles of this class. I will add that the Soviet SS-20 missiles are equipped with three warheads each, while the Pershing and cruise missiles are single-warhead weapons.

[Kornikov] Since we're describing our new initiative as a whole, I would like to add yet another point -- and a very important one -- that the Soviet proposal relating to the so-called Euromissiles cuts the Gordian knot not only on this issue. It also is aimed at giving a positive impetus to the work of other very important spheres of disarmament talks, namely on space and on strategic offensive arms.

[Agayants] So, as we see, Moscow once again has demonstrated to the whole world an example of the constructive application -- the application not in words, but in effect -- of political thinking that is needed to raise civilization to a qualitatively new level. These are the proposals which the USSR has placed on the table at the Geneva negotiations with the United States. As is known, it is the United States' fault that the draft agreement is, in effect, marking time. The time has come for decisions. This, judging by the numerous comments from abroad, publications by the press, radio and the television commentaries, and speeches by political and public figures and in various countries, is being awaited by the peoples of our planet. There is an historic chance that will make it possible to curb the nuclear arms race and achieve important accords. This chance must not be missed. And what about the West? What was the official reaction there to our initiative?

[Kornilov] Well, here, as an example, is the viewpoint of FRG Foreign Minister Genscher. I quote: Having proposed to resolve the issue of medium-range missiles, the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee has removed the main obstacle to achieving an agreement concerning a final withdrawal from Europe of all Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles. The readiness of the USSR, he states, to embark immediately on talks concerning operational-tactical missiles meets both the FRG's requirements and security interests in Europe.

[Agayants] Well now, the position has been set forth, it would seem, with the utmost clarity. It could be regarded as an asset. The word has been spoken, let us now await action. The overall tone of the commertaries to be heard from across the ocean was optimistic. The United States treated the Soviet proposal with increased interest. In my opinion, one should note a point that is particularly symptomatic and important for today: The Americans see in the Soviet initiative a real possibility to shift the process of disarmament talks from its standstill. For the first time in 3 months, President Ronald Reagan appeared, not for long, at the White House press center. He emphasized that he welcomes the proposals put forward by the Soviet leader on achieving an agreement on Euromissiles separately from agreements in other spheres. In order not to miss the given opportunity, I have given instructions to our participants in the Geneva talks to produce as early as 4 March a draft text of a treaty on medium-range nuclear weapons, Ronald Reagan said.

[Dmitriyev] Now, when the possibility of an accord with us has begun to appear in outline, a sharp political struggle has begun in the United States, and evidently it will continue. The right-wing forces are beginning to raise their heads because the possibility of a breakthrough in talks on disarmament issues does not suit them. There also are those who play up to the right-wingers, like, let's say, Henry Kissinger, who pretends to be concerned for the interests of Western Europe and NATO. They are beginning to sow doubt on the wisdome of the West of accepting in general the Reykjavik formula on medium-range missiles and maintain that the withdrawal of all U.S. Pershing and cruise missiles from Western Europe, under conditions of Soviet superiority in operational-tactical missiles and conventional arms, will, allegedly, lead to the undocking of the allies' security from U.S. security, meaning that it will rock the foundations of the North Atlantic bloc.

In this regard, the U.S. newspaper THE WASHINGTON POST notes that a proper agreement on medium-range weapons will not deprive Europe of its defensive forces. The U.S. nuclear umbrella will remain there as before. NATO will keep for itself the U.S. medium-range nuclear weapons sited on aircraft carriers; I might add that the United States has 15 aircraft carriers. However, one feels in all these commentaries from the right flank of U.S. Politics a little note of hopelessness: How will the United States and NATO be able to reject the zero option on medium-range missiles in Europe, which they themselves proposed? And, under these conditions, the Right is ready, if not to prevent an agreement, at the very least to hamper it, to raise the price for the USSR. The draft agreement now on the Geneva negotiating table contains the requirement for the strictest verification of the observance of the agreement. This is a well-known device with the aid of which the Americans have tried more than once to crystallize their positions on disarmament issues.

[Agayants] A discordant note was struck in the light of the facts set forth earlier by the voice of Paris. In a communique published by the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs, it was stated that the government's position on medium-range missiles remains unchanged, that is to say, that taking into account the existing imbalance in conventional and chemical types of weapons in Europe -- as it was put, an imbalance not to the advantage of the West -- of course, in the opinion of the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs, it is essential to avoid removal of nuclear weapons from West German territory. Judging by everything on the Quai d'Orsay, where the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs is situated, they did not consult with the Elysee Palace.

[Dmitriyev] For the sake of accuracy, one has to say that the official French position on this issue underwent a correction. President Mitterrand, after the statement of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs had been published, stated that the prospect of U.S. and Soviet medium-range missiles in Europe being scrapped and reduced, I quote, is in the interests of France and the world; observers note that the known change for the better in the French position is apparent; it testifies to the presence of a certain realism toward Soviet proposals for nuclear disarmament measures.

[Agayants] But here's what is revealing, Boris Dmitiryevich. Prime Minister Chirac also spoke out in the same vein at a cabinet session. However, despite the fact that the heads of the French state and government made positive assessment of the Soviet initiative after a certain interval, a number of politicians in right-wing parties and some from the ranks of the Socialist Party gave it a hostile reception. That is how hardy their attachment to the stereotypes of the past, their nuclear thinking are.

[Dmitriyev] I should like to stress once again that the Soviet proposal on medium-range missiles does not overshadow, and particularly does not remove from the agenda, the issue of substantially reducing and immediately after that scrapping strategic armaments. An agreement on this score will become possible alongside a decision on not allowing weapons to be sited in space by virtue of the integral interconnection between these matters. If our conversation has gone into issues related to strategic armaments and space, I should like to divert the attention of our radio listeners for a couple of minutes to talk about a rather interesting incident that happened last week during a respectable, prestigious international conference held in Britain, not far from London. It was a very prestigious conference of Western political scientists in which leading figures from the ministries of foreign affairs of Britain and France, and of the State Department took part. It was the 302d [as heard] such conference, and, for the first time, a Soviet representative also was invited.

After the Soviet participant -- and this lot fell to me -- had made his report, in which an appropriate assessment of the US plans for the Strategic Defence Initiative was given, the floor was taken by one of the U.S. representatives, the vice-president of a respectable New York institute that performs the role of the U.S. Republican administration's think tank. This American said that our Russian colleague, in talking about the Strategic Defense Initiative, spared no argument in stressing that SDI is an element in the offensive strategy of the United States, which intends siting weapons in space, possibly even nuclear ones. I, the American said, should like to state that there is no intention to site any nuclear weapons in space; moreover, no provision is being made for anything that could be called weaponry in space. In a word, the American representative did not acknowledge any of the arguments that were cited to him on this score. He demanded that sufficiently authoritative evidence, emanating from the leadership of the Strategic Defense Initiative, be given to him. Thus it transpired that on the following morning, just before the routine morning session, in the library of the same building where the conference was being held, my eye was caught by an article in London's THE TIMES that contained an interview with one of those directing the Strategic Defense Initiative, General Eugene (Fox). I took this article along with me to the session, and, at a convenient moment, directed the attention of my U.S. colleague to it, having asked whether he knew Gen Eugene (Fox), and whether this general was authoritative enough to pass judgment on the nature of the Strategic Defense Initiative. The American said he knew this General well and collaborated with him. Then the American was told that this same general stated plainly and precisely in an interview to London's THE TIMES that despite the U.S. statement that SDI would not be of a nuclear nature, development [razrabotka] is continuing within the SDI framework with regard to equipping this system with nuclear warheads.

[Agayants] Boris Dmitriyevich, what was the reaction of your American colleague at the conference?

[Dmitriyev] First he asked to be given this article so that he could have a look at it. He studied Gen Eugene (Fox)'s interview throughout the session. He sat silently, looked out of the window. All the other participants cast glances at him, ranging from sympathy to unconcealed irony. He did not say a word, and when the session was over he came over to the Soviet representative together with the chairman of this conference and said: Well, all right, I shall have to announce my complete capitulation. It is evident that the U.S. general, with whom we in the institute collaborate closely, does not intend to inform us fully of his plans, and I admit that the U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative system really does envisage the deployment of nuclear weapons in space.

[Agayants] On 5 March, Comrades, 41 years had passed since Winston Churchill made an anti-Soviet speech in the U.S. town of Fulton. The myth of the Soviet threat to the West drags on from that time. A period that was to become known as the Cold War emanated from the same speech. Over the past 4 decades and even a little longer, imperialism's ideologues have added little to what was said at Fulton. Neither the collection of stock phrases serving as a screen to justify the hegemonist claims of the so-called Free World, nor the anti-Soviet propagandistic cliches have changed. One can follow without much difficulty the dangerous thread that runs like a Bickford [English inventor, 1794-1834] fuse from Churchill's speech in Fulton that has become true gospel for anticommunists, through the Truman and other militarist doctrines to the present preachers of neoglobalism who declare the USSR to be an evil empire.

[Kornilov] Indeed, Nikolay Ivanovich, there are, I would say, anniversaries and would-be anniversaries, and the second category is the place for the 40th anniversary of the 12 March 1947 proclamation of the Truman Doctrine in the United States.

You are right, this data gives cause for thought, and not only about the past, because, the heart of the Truman Doctrine, its core, was intoxicating strength and reliance on the atomic striking force. Although today, 40 years later, the situation in the world is quite different from what it was then -- Washington's atomic monopoly has been relegated to the past forever, and military and strategic parity between the countries of the Warsaw Pact and NATO has become a major and indisputable fact in modern-day international life -- but the aggressive imperial postulates that guided Truman and company in their time are in full bloom in Washington even today. Here is just one fact: If in 1946 Washington responded to the USSR's proposal to make nuclear weapons unlawful by intensifying the arms race, then today, as we have already said, the United States is responding to our proposal to make the world nuclear-free by the year 2000 by augmenting the Star Wars program. Here is another parallel for you that automatically suggests itself: The Truman Doctrine, which proceeded from the possibility and permissible nature of carrying out atomic bombings on the USSR, literally was permeated with a spirit of confrontation and contempt for the sovereignty of states and their legitimate right to be in charge of their destiny. Over the 40 years that have passed since those days, the planet's political map has changed beyond recognition, but even today it is the United States that is flouting the sacred principle of sovereignty as laid down in the UN Charter and in the Helsinki Final Act.

Well, we sometimes say that historical parallels in politics are, to a certain degree, always relative. Let it be so. However, one recalls such facts as, for example, the occupation of independent Grenada, the U.S. air raids on Libya, or, say, the U.S. attempts to overthrow the Nicaraguan Government, a question arises involuntarily: Could it be that the so-called doctrine of neoglobalism developed by the current administration is an updated version of the old and seemingly long-obsolete Truman Doctrine?

[Dmitriyev] Here is another remark in connection with the event that took place 40 years ago. In my opinion, the Truman Doctrine laid down a milestone from which, through Washington's fault, the splitting fo the international political line into two enemy camps began. The Truman Doctrine started a process in the course of which the USSR and the Soviet people were presented as an image of the enemy, an image of the adversary that one has to fight with all one's strength and destroy at any cost. We now have to deal with the consequences of that decision made 40 years ago. The USSR and other realistically thinking forces have to defuse the political and ideological atmosphere in the world; they have to come out for substituting the image of the enemy for that of partner. The latest acts by the Soviet leadership are dedicated to this end, including the Moscow forum "For a Nuclear-Free World, for the Survival of Humanity."

[Kornilov] In other words, the point is to throw away the old postulates, to reconfirm the unfounded claims of the ruling circles of any country -- the United States in this case -- to the world's leadership, and to assert a new political thinking corresponding to the realities of our nuclear age.

[Agayants] Carrying out a kind of tuning-up to the restructuring that is currently underway in the USSR, some Western sovietologists, primarily American ones, are trying to present the processes of democratization taking place in our country as a kind of reaction to Western demands, something amounting to nothing less than a concession to outside pressure. Is that so, Yuriy Immanuilovich?

[Kornilov] Such attempts have taken place, it is true, and one has to say directly that statements of this kind are so absurd that one need not bother to refute them. It is more than obvious that when speaking about democratization, we in the USSR mean first of all the restoration of the true tone of socialist democracy, and the full development and implementation of the Leninist principles of socialist people's power. Today's world is witnessing not the closing but, on the contrary, the opening of the gap between socialist democracy and dictatorship of monopolistic capital.

One could cite many facts -- of course, our listeners know them -- showing that in the United States a gigantic state machine of violence and tyranny has been created and set in full motion, through which the powers that be are carrying out mass reprisals aginst the dissenters and are virtually hunting down dissidents, even if their fault is nothing more than appeals to curb militarism and the arms race. Frankly speaking, Soviet public opinion wil believe the claims to democratism in Western societies when they liquidate the gaping abyss between the rich and the poor, begin electing freely the owners of works and factories and bank managers, and when the media starts criticizing on a regular basis corporations, banks and their bosses, and not figureheads who are, in the end, no more than big business executives. I would say here that the powers that be in the United States, before getting down to lecturing others, should cast a sober glance at what is taking place on their own doorstep. Moreover, one could add with good reason that it is difficult, even very difficult, to deal with an administration that so openly spreads and cultivates militarism and so grossly and on a mass scale violates democratic principles and essential human rights as the United States is doing now. The Soviet public has accumulated a large potential of mistrust to official Washington, including its policies in the area of human rights; considerable and serious changes have to take place in U.S. domestic and foreign policy to dispel this mistrust.

[Agayants] Coming back to what we have already said here, to the need to restructure international relations on the basis of a new political thinking, one has to stress the importance of the steps being undertaken by our diplomacy. I mean the trip of Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze, USSR foreign minister, to a number of countries in the Asian-Pacific region.

[Dmitriyev] Soviet diplomacy today is on the rise and is vigorously on the move. Routes of active actions and dialogue are stretching from Smolensk Square, where the high-rise building of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs is situated, to the North and South, to the West and East. The addressbook of mankind does not contain any country with which we would not wish to cooperate actively in the interests of peace and security for all. Eduard Amvrosiyevicy Shevardnadze is now on his tour of countries of the Asian-Pacific region. Before that he visited the capital of Thailand, where talks with the country's prime minister and foreign minister took place. The capital of Australia followed. It so happened that this visit to Australia was the first official visit by a Soviet foreign minister in all the 45 years since establishing diplomatic relations between our countries, as well, by the way, as the first official visits by our minister to other countries included in the itinerary of the current tour. First meetings are always a bit difficult. In one Australian capital town, guns are stil pointed toward the ocean, allegedly they were installed in the last century to rebuff a Russian invasion. Who could tell now if this really was the initial purpose of the guns; was not the version of a Russian invasion concocted in recent decades when the myth of the Soviet threat started spreading around the world? However that may be, the Soviet guests have been met with more than their share of prejudices. Americans and other Westerners are fuelling fears by spreading inventions about a buildup of the Soviet naval presence in the Pacific and Indian Ocean, about a certain design by Moscow in supporting the nuclear-free status of the southern part of the Pacific, about Soviet military bases in Vietnam.

That is why Soviet diplomacy is working so vigorously to destroy the reefs of mistrust and suspicions on our account. Australia, where 100 municipalities and even an entire state have proclaimed their territories to be nuclear-arms-free, cannot be remote from our country, which has come forward with a project for a nuclear-free world.

Indonesia cannot be remote from us and be simply good memories of the past when our countries were linked by the ties of friendship and cooperation; it remains a travelling companion to this country. And, of course, the three Indochinese countries -- Laos, Cambodia, and Vietnam -- where a visit by Comrade Shevardnadze started today [as heard] in an atmosphere of fraternal efficiency and mutual understanding, are partucularly close to us. This is the practical implementation of the appeal to countries of Asia and the Pacific to start a joint search for ways to guarantee security for all in this region, voiced in the Vladivostok speech by the general secretary.

[Agayants] Our program has drawn to a close. But before bringing it to a full close, I would like, on behalf of its participants, to congratulate all women listeners and all women on the beautiful and happy holiday of 8 March and to wish you sound health, successes in your undertakings, full happiness, and high spirits! Thank you, Comrades, for listening, All the best to you.

REAGAN RADIO ADDRESS ON 'SHIFTS' IN RELATIONS

LD072035 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2005 GMT 7 Mar 87

[Text] Washington, 7 Mar (TASS) -- President Reagan has called the state of Soviet-U.S. relations a question of great importance to all inhabitants of the planet. In his latest radio address, the head of the Washington administration noted that shifts have occurred recently in certain areas of relations between two of the largest states in the world.

Referring to regional conflicts, he reaffirmed U.S. Government support for the counterrevolutionary formations by whose hands Washington is unsuccessfully endeavoring to overthrow the legitimate Sandinist government of Nicaragua. Here the president tried yet again to present the bands of Somozist cutthroats as "fighters for democracy."

Further Report

LD072348 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 7 Mar 87

[Text] In his weekly address to the nation President Reagan attempted to connect prospects of better relations between the United States and the USSR, which he spoke of as being of key importance to peace, with the problem of regional conflicts.

Though he said there (?has) been progress in relations between the two great countries he nevertheless again resorted to standard attacks on the policy of the Soviet Union in various parts of the world. He repeated his administration's support for the contras in Nicaragua and the terrorists in Afghanistan, who are opposing the lawful governments in those countries.

COMMENT CONTINUES ON REAGAN'S 'IRANGATE' SPEECH

Biryukov: 'Perplexing' Speech

LD061822 Moscow TASS in English 1947 GMT 5 Mar 87

[Text] Moscow March 5 TASS -- Political News Analyst Askold Biryukov writes:

When addressing the American people President Reagan at long last accepted responsibility for the loud scandal that has come to be known in America as "Irangate" and has done much damage to Washington's reputation.

He said that as disappointed as he may be in some who served him he still was the one who must answer to the American people for what he described as a "mistake". The President publicy pledged "to put the house in even better order".

The President said he had also "directed that any covert activity be in support of clear policy objectives and in compliance with American values."

The President's order, let's put it bluntly, is perplexing. What values is he referring to? The traditional values of the American people? But as the dirty knot known as "Irangate" was being untied it became clear to all that this was an immoral policy, a direct violation of elementary moral standards.

Not to mention "values". So maybe the President is abandoning all this, throwing overboard the past "mistakes" and taking a fresh start? Maybe, for example, he is abandoning his pet creation -- "Project Democracy" -- the roots of which nourished the Iran-contras clandestine operation and its direct perpetrator Oliver North and to this day continue to nourish other of Washington's covert foreign policy actions?

Maybe he will cancel the secret directive, signed by him a year ago, permitting the American CIA to abduct people in other countries under the pretext of combatting terrorism and bring them to the United States? It was already at that time that the administration's opponents in Congress, and in the CIA for that matter, as it was noted by THE WALL STREET JOURNAL, openly pointed out that such operations contradict international law, that they might result in attempts to abduct people simply because Washington does not like them, and this, quite obviously, is immoral.

Finally, maybe the President has decided to do without "low intensity conflict" which was declared by his secretary of state to be one of he main tasks of ensuring the national security of the United States or, to quote the President, a "clear policy objective" or an "American value".

But the administration has resorted to such actions, is resorting to them and is going to resort to them in the future in respect of sovereign states which are targets of open or only slightly camouflaged interference, including armed interference and including interference with the use of mercenaries. Such actions, quite often undertaken under the pretext of combatting "international terrorism", actually mean only a still worse crime because such actions, this time actions of state terrorism by the United States, claim as their victims a still greater number of people, the sovereignty of states and international law, not to mention such values, including American ones, as ordinary morality and justice.

It is very doubtful that they in Washington have abruptly discontinued such and other similar covert operations and overt interference. So the impression is that the President's latest speech, planned as a response to criticism and demands of public opinion, in reality is an attempt to impart respectability to U.S. covert operations, to things that can never be justified by anyone even if they are done under the slogan "America uber alles."

Kolesnichenko: 'Not Over Yet'

PM081513 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Mar 87 First Edition p 5

[Tomas Kolesnichenko "Commentator's Column": "Not Over Yet"]

[Text] "The Reagan administration has fallen!" -- this sentence, which can be seen nowadays in the pages of U.S. newspapers, reflects the essence of the changes at the very top of the U.S. political hierarchy.

Indeed, the President's staff of closest aides has virtually collapsed with the resignation of omnipotent Donald Regan, who played the role of "prime minister" in the present administration. Moreover, H. Baker, the new White House chief of staff, has created (something unprecedented) a "transitional group." Usually it is appointed only on the handover of power from one president to another and selects the administration's new composition.

This is the price -- and, evidently, still far from the full price -- that the President is paying to calm the waves of the scandal connected with the sale of weapons to Iran and the transfer of the resultant funds to the Nicaraguan "contras," bypassing Congress. As the facts show -- and they are being added to daily -- the White House not only sanctioned that affair but is trying to cover up the traces and hide from the public the scale of the illegal operations.

By U.S. standards this is a misdemeanor which raises the question of the head of executive power remaining in office -- that is, whether it is at all possible to trust the administration and the President personally. This is why the White House needed a "lightning rod" to direct the blows of criticism onto the President's entourage while leaving himself out of it. This in many respects was the function fulfilled by the Tower Commission. The report it published states that R. Reagan personally knew nothing and was aware of nothing -- all the disgraceful things are said to have been perpetrated behind his back.

Then the question of the President's competence arose. How is it possible to lead the country and not know what even your closest aides are doing? On Wednesday R. Reagan appeared on national television with a statement which even beforehand had been advertized as "the most important in all the administration's years in power." Its supertask was to put an end to "Irangate" and consign that scandal to history.

However, the President's speech not only did not clear up the situation but made it still more confused. On the one hand, he admitted that "U.S. strategy with regard to Iran" (that is, the illegal arms deals) was a mistake. He also admitted that precisely he, the head of the administration, bears responsibility for everything. At the same time, he declared that many operations were conducted by White House staffers without his knowledge and that he "does not remember" many things at all, for example, whether he had sanctioned arms deliveries to Iran from the outset, then where the money earmarked for the "contras" had been transferred to, and so forth. He also promised "an exhaustive review" of all secret operations and vowed to consult with Congress on everything and to get rid of everyone involved in "Irangate." Yet it is no secret that just the previous day he had tried to approve as the new CIA director someone personally involved in the scandal.

In short, R. Reagan's statement did not fulfill its purpose. The scandal over "Irangate" continues to run high. All the more so, as the investigation into that affair is not yet over and, I believe, new exposures still await those involved in it.

Pogodin on 'Unanswered Questions'

LD061550 Moscow World Service in English 1410 GMT 6 Mar 87

[Text] We follow now with comments from Aleksandr Pogodin on President Reagan's speech on Irangate.

It is interesting to follow the evolution of presidential statements as this scandal unfolded, a scandal caused by the exposure of secret American arms sales to Iran and the use of the proceeds from the illegal operation to finance the criminal actions of Nicaraguan contras. About 3 months ago, when the first reports appeared in the press, Ronald Reagan called then absolutely false. Now he is forced to recognize serious mistakes, though he assures that he was guided by good intentions.

The most important and alarming conclusion can be made of the facts that have become known and been proved. For a long time, top-level administration members secretly engaged in activities incompatible not only with American law but with the principles they proclaimed to the whole world. In the course of these activities, military-political decisions were made that sharply increased tension in different parts of the planet. This inevitably evokes a number of questions that are now asked in the United States and other countries. What is Washington's mechanism of making most serious decisions directly connected with the state of the international situation? How predictable is the policy of the U.S. Administration? To what extent can the United States be trusted to observe its commitments?

These and other natural questions remain unanswered so far. The President has promised, though, that now he will put everything in order and that there will be no violations of the law at the White House in future. But such promises were made in the past many times, so it will be better to wait and see. We should also wait because the political scandal in Washington is far from over. According to one American paper, only the tip of the Irangate iceberg is visible to the public.

The investigation continues. Meanwhile, Congressman Henry Gonzalez has already introduced a draft bill which proposes suspending the President from power and invoking impeachment procedures.

U.S. TRYING TO DISTRACT ATTENTION FROM 'IRANGATE'

LD072210 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 7 Mar 87

[Text] TASS political Observer Yuriy Kornilov:

For certain circles in Washington it has become a sort of rule: The worse things are going at home, the greater the temptation to distract the public's attention, and gain points through stirring up tension and aggressive foreign policy adventures. It seems this rule is operating now, too, when the murky waves of Irangate are hitting the side of the U.S. ship of state more and more forcefully, lashing both the arms of the navigator and the captain's cabin. This fact, for instance, attracts the attention: Precisely after it had become obvious that the tumors of Irangate had struck all the components, all the levers, wheels and screws of the Washington government mechanism, precisely after that a course was adopted in the United States toward stepping up even more than before the preparations for "Star Wars." The architects of SDI set about zealously looking for loopholes in the USSR-U.S. ABM Treaty of 1972, forcefully giving that document a so-called broad interpretation, and thereby untying the hands of those who wanted to bury it.

Can one regard as a chance coincidence the fact that just at the height of Irangate Washington sanctioned the 25th and then the 26th blast of a nuclear device in the last 18 months in Nevada, although the Soviet Union was warning that if those blasts took place it would consider itself to be free from the unilateral moratorium? The same series of militarist, hegemonistic actions includes Washington's stubborn resistance to the process of a peaceful settlement in Afghanistan, which is proven by a statement -- only just brought to light in the U.S. capital -- by Oakley, a representative of the State Department. The same series includes the massed concentration of U.S. naval forces in the eastern Mediterranean, the Persian Gulf region, as well. On that point many observers are asking a disturbing, but entirely logical and well-grounded question: Will not those who are at the helm of the U.S. ship of state attempt to go for broke, as it were, on the international political scene, calculating thereby on patching up, or at least concealing from people's eyes, the breach in the bottom of their own political vessel?

SHULTZ TO MAKE RETURN VISIT TO SOVIET UNION

LD070819 Moscow TASS in English 0818 GMT 7 Mar 87

[Text] In accordance with an understanding reached, U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz is to go on a return visit to the USSR in mid-April.

BAKER ASKS KOEHLER TO RESIGN AFTER 1 WEEK

LD072259 Moscow TASS in English 2226 GMT 7 Mar 87

[Text] Washington March 7 TASS -- New White House Chief of Staff Howard Baker asked director of the White House Office of Communications John Koehler to resign. John Koehler assumed this post only a week ago. Reporting this step, THE WASHINGTON POST writes that it is part of Baker's screening of members of the White House apparatus. But the main reason to remove Koehler from a post in the White House is different. Soon after Koehler's appointment had been announced it had been established that John Koehler, an American of the German origin, had been a member of the Hitlerjugend in the past. In conditions when the administration came under the fire of criticism because of the scandalous revelations about the Irangate affair, the White House tries to remove all other sources for trouble. A spokesman of the White House refused to confirm or comment on THE WASHINGTON POST report about Koehler's impending resignation.

TIMERBAYEV ON 'HOSTILE' ENVIRONMENT AT UN

LD061955 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1834 GMT 6 Mar 87

[Text] New York 6 Mar (TASS) -- The UN Committee on Relations with the Host Country has again drawn public attention to the reluctance or inability of the U.S. authorities to properly carry out their international obligations to foreign missions accredited to the United Nations. At today's meeting of the committee, R.M. Timerbayev, the USSR's first deputy permanent representative at the United Nations, produced incontrovertible evidence of the hostile environment created around the Soviet mission. He said that in February alone 2,447 telephone calls were recorded and dozens of letters were received containing various kinds of threats toward Soviet people. The USSR representative demanded that the normal working of Soviet diplomats accredited to the United Nations should be guaranteed.

FURTHER ON SHEVARDNADZE VISIT TO INDONESIA

Talks With Mokhtar

LD061304 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1235 GMT 6 Mar 87

[Text] Jakarta, 6 Mar (TASS) -- Talks were held here today between E.A. Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR minister of foreign affairs, who is in the Indonesian capital on an official visit, and Indonesian Foreign Minister Mokhtar Kusumaatmaja. During the talks, which were held in a friendly and businesslike atmosphere, the ministers spoke of the closeness of the positions of the USSR and Indonesia on current cardinal issues and expressed their mutual interest in the further development and deepening of relations between the Soviet Union and Indonesia in the political, trade, and economic spheres and is broadening exchanges in culture and sport.

Further on Talks

LD061453 Moscow TASS in English 1414 GMT 6 Mar 87

[Text] Jakarta March 6 TASS -- Eduard Shevardnadze, a member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee and foreign minister of the USSR, and Indonesian Foreign Minister Mokhtar Kusumaatmaja conferred here today.

During the talks, which passed in a friendly and businesslike atmosphere, they stated the closeness or identity of the positions of the USSR and Indonesia on such cardinal issues of the times as those of building a comprehensive system of international peace and security, bridling the arms race, first of all the nuclear arms race, preventing it from spilling over into outer space, and putting an end to nuclear testing.

Stress was made on the need to establish a new international economic order and the close connection between the problems of disarmament and development. Mokhtar Kusumaatmaja positively received information about the latest Soviet proposal on medium-range missiles.

Much attention was paid to the situation in the Asia-Pacific region. Eduard Shevardnadze dwelled upon the key aspects of the Soviet program for stronger security and peaceful and equitable cooperation in Asia and the Pacific, which has been set forth in Mikhail Gorbachev's statements in Vladivostok and New Delhi. The Indonesian side voiced support for the constructive ideas laid down in the program.

The Soviet and Indonesian foreign ministers pointed to the need to step up efforts to settle conflict situations in the regions, lower the level of tension and military confrontation, and affirm an atmosphere of trust, goodneighborliness and peaceful cooperation.

As the situation in South Asia was discussed, both sides reiterated their invariable stand in favor of resolving the problems existing in that region through peaceful political means, by promoting dialogue between the two groups of states situated there. A common interest was expressed during the talks in further developing and deepening relations between the Soviet Union and Indonesia in the political, commercial and economic fields and in broader exchanges in the fields of culture and sport.

Mokhtar Speaks at Dinner

LD061837 Moscow TASS in English 1821 GMT 6 Mar 87

[Text] Jakarta March 6 TASS -- Indonesian Foreign Minister Mokhtar Kusumaatmaja has expressed profound satisfaction with the continued strengthening of understanding and development of mutually beneficial cooperation between his country and the Soviet Union.

He was speaking here today at a dinner for Edward Shevardnadze, a member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committeee and foreign minister of the USSR.

Commenting on the world situation, Kusumaatmaja said the ongoing arms race was not benefiting any country, while posing a threat to the very existence of mankind.

That was why, he stressed, it was a duty of all nations, in the first place the nuclear powers, to show a sense of responsibility and apply efforts to achieve a multilateral agreement on a complete end to nuclear weapons testing.

The Indonesian foreign minister expressed himself for a peaceful settlement of regional conflicts. In this connection he spoke with satisfaction about steps taken to settle the situation concerning Afghanistan, in particular the significance of the Soviet Union's initiative towards this goal.

One of the founders of the Non-Aligned Movement, Indonesia, he said, would continue making a positive contribution to efforts to attain the aims and lofty ideals of that movement.

Shevardnadze Responds

LD062215 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 Mar 87 p 4

[TASS report under the general headline: "Talks in Jakarta"]

[Text] Shevardnadze delivered an answering speech. The sight of your necklace of islands, the Soviet minister said, reminded me of the song about Indonesia which describes how it draws a man to itself and leads him to the southern lands. That song was very popular in our country at one time. I should like that motif to be as familiar to present generations as it is to my own. However, now other motifs which extend far beyond the bounds of our countries, have brought us to Indonesia.

The main one is - security.

Universal and all-embracing security.

Regional security.

Security for each and equal for all.

In repeating this word -- a key word for the destinies of mankind -- we are not indulging in incantations. Security as we understand it is not a rhetorical premise, not an abstraction. The way we interpret this concept, and what we see in it and beyond it, were described convincingly by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the Central Committee of our party, in his Vladivistok speech.

Security means first and foremost a reduction in the level of military activity and military rivalry everywhere and at all levels.

Security means a reduction of the military presence of all powers beyond the confines of their national borders.

Security means trust among countries arising as a result of the implementation of certain measures which give them complete confidence that force, or the threat of force, will not be used against them.

To fill out this triple formula with concrete content, let me draw your attention to M.S. Gorbachev's speech at the recent Moscow forum, "For a Nuclear-Free World, for the Survival of Humanity" -- to that part of the speech which dealt with the necessity of fully eliminating foreign military bases.

If our partners are serious in what they say about trust and are prepared to underpin it with the appropriate monitoring [kontrol] measures, then it will be necessary to reach agreement on access to military bases for the purpose of inspection. This is to enable one to be certain that activity banned by this or that agreement is not being carried out there. Evidently, the cooperation of the states on whose soil these bases are located will be required here.

Your shores are washed by the waters of two oceans -- the Pacific and the Indian. There is a fortunate combination of currents and streams here.

In that same region a concentration of islands with a military threat, dangerous for peace and security, has emerged, an entire archipelago of military bases.

They should not be here, as, moreover, there should be no permanent foreign military presence in any region of the world. We relate that demand, as M.S. Gorbachev emphasized, to ourselves as well, taking practical steps in that direction.

For example, in supporting the efforts of Indonesia in the regional dialogue, the aim of which is to turn Southeast Asia into a nuclear-free zone, we should like to hope that this will meet with the same support from the other nuclear powers.

Unfortunately, some precedents in the recent past have saddened us. Not only us -- all nations are disappointed that the other side wrecked the moratorium on the conducting of nuclear weapons tests. Nevertheless the Soviet Union intends to continue to cooperate closely with those states which wish to end the arms race. We know that Indonesia wants that.

There are two diametrically opposed approaches to the issue of arms, possessing them and getting rid of them.

With the first, the traditional one, it is as though the improvement and accumulation of arms is sanctified through invoking the people, carried out on their behalf and for their sake. In this case they say that, arms are necessary to defend the people.

With the second -- I shall not be afraid to call it innovative and fully in accord with the realities of the time -- there is a real desire to rid oneself of suicidal arms for the sake of the genuine, vital and essential interests of the people. In this case they say that disarmament is necessary to defend the people against an excessive burden of expenditure, to raise the standard of their life and make it happy and full-blooded.

Today, probably, the highest state and political wisdom must be nourished, not by falsely understood ideas of strength and superiority, but by something else.

Today, strength and superiority consist of common sense and a realization of the total senselessness of nuclear arms.

It is precisely in the sense of this strength that one must examine M.S. Gorbachev's recent statement on singling out the issue of intermediate-range missiles from the familiar Reykjavik package -- which opens up the opportunity for a significant reduction of such missiles in Asia, too.

This is dictated by an awareness of our responsibility for the fate of the world. None of the other explanations of our decision correspond to the reality. Some of them are laughable. We can only smile at the claims made by certain Western statesmen to the effect that only forceful pressure on the Soviet Union compelled it to take such a step.

Everything undertaken by us in building the edifice of international security has sound foundations. Copyright [avtorskoye pravo] and the experience accumulated by other peoples are being deeply interpreted from the current standpoint. We can see a direct spiritual and political kinship, for example, between the Bandung principles, formulated over 30 years ago, and those of the Delhi declaration, signed last year.

In our talks with you, Minister, we see a model of the activieness in contacts between the states of the region which are contacts seeking to maintain in it an atmosphere of trust, goodneighborliness and cooperation. We value the atmosphere of frankness in which the discussion of the state of affairs in the world, regional problems and the state of our bilateral relations took place.

Our attention to the Asian-Pacific region is based on the obvious fact that tension, threats and anxieties can be alleviated only through joint efforts.

We continue to take as our starting-point the fact that there are in this region no problems that could not be resolved by political means at the negotiating table on the basis of the principles of equality, noninterference in one another's internal affairs, and mutual recognition of parties' legitimate interests.

I should like to return home with the conviction that our meetings and talks will serve to strengthen and develop the friendly relations, and deepen the mutual understanding and trust, between the Soviet Union and Indonesia. For all this, in our view, accords with the fundamental interests of the peoples of our countries, and with the interests of international peace and cooperation.

ICELAND'S HERMANNSSON MAKES OFFICIAL MOSCOW VISIT

Welcomed at Airport

LD011823 Moscow TASS in English 1743 GMT 1 Mar 87

[Text] Moscow March 1 TASS -- Prime Minister Steingrimur Hermannsson of Iceland and his wife today arrived in Moscow on an official visit at the invitation of the Soviet Government.

On the tarmac of Sheremetyevo Airport he was met by N. Ryzhkov, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and his wife, V. Murakhovskiy, first deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, and other officials.

State flags of Iceland and the Soviet Union were hoisted at the airport. A guard of honour from troops of the Moscow Garrison was mustered at the airfield. The orchestra played the state anthems of the two countries.

Ryzhkov and Hermannsson reviewed the honour guard.

The formal ceremony ended with the march past the guard of honour.

The streets and squares of Moscow, through which the motorcade escorted by motorcade outriders proceeded, were docked with the state flags of the two countries and streamers. [Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian on page 1 of its 3 March Morning Edition carries a TASS report under the heading "Official Visit" on Icelandic Prime Minister Hermannsson's arrival in Moscow, providing the names of Soviet officials present in the welcoming party at the airport not mentioned in the referent item: "M.S. Smirtyukov, administrator of affairs of the USSR Council of Ministers; N.I. Kotlyar, USSR minister of the fish industry; M.V. Gramov, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Physical Culture and Sports; and I.N. Krasavin, USSR ambassador to Iceland."

Meets With Gorbachev

PM041211 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Mar 87 First Edition pp 1-2

[TASS report: "Meeting between M.S. Gorbachev and Steingrimur Hermannsson"]

[Text] On 2 March, in the Kremlin, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev met Steingrimur Hermannsson, prime minister of the Republic of Iceland. It is symbolic, Comrade Gorbachev said in greeting the guest, that your visit coincides with an important step in the spirit of Reykjavik, our proposal concerning nuclear missiles in Europe. Reykjavik is alive. It has shown everyone that an opportunity exists to reach accords on problems of the most major significance with which mankind's survival is linked. It was a major breakthrough and we did everything to retain the height attained there. Reykjavik has come to occupy a firm place in international life and we will not permit ourselves to be dragged backward in Geneva.

Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev again thanked the government and people of Iceland for responding to the request to stage the Soviet-American meeting in their capital and for doing all they could for its success. [paragraph continues]

The interlocutors agreed that following Reykjavik, only further progress is possible and, in Hermannsson's words, only such work is possible as will make it continue to play its part both in Soviet-American relations and in East-West relations; in relations between the North and the South, in general, in relations between people.

The fact that our mind is indeed made up to search for solutions in the Reykjavik spirit, Comrade Gorbachev emphasized, also is evident in our proposal on European missiles. Thus, we again invite the U.S. Administration to continue the search on the basis of Reykjavik.

The Moscow forum For a Nuclear-Free World, for the Survival of Humanity, has played a major part in this decision of ours. We experienced at close quarters the mood of the international public, its concern and alarm, caused by the reaction of certain circles to Reykjavik, by the fact that it has not been found possible to put a halt to nuclear testing, by the SALT II treaty having been undermined, and by the fact that the ABM Treaty was threatened.

We thought it all over very seriously and decided to make yet another step that could lead to serious progress. If an agreement on medium-range missiles can be achieved -- and I am confident that it is possible -- it will have major political significance, since, up until now, we only have been arming ourselves, while in this case we would commence the process of disarming ourselves.

It would create an atmosphere of greater trust. It is of substance in purely military terms, too, since a considerable proportion of an entire type of nuclear arms would be eliminated and an entire continent would be rid of them.

We also would like the medium-range missiles agreement to provide an impetus to the talks on reducing strategic arms, in conjunction with refraining from abandoning the ABM Treaty, and to promote the commencement of the talks on conventional arms and armed forces, to speed up the progress in the case of eliminating chemical weapons.

Psychologically, it would improve the prospects for resolving regional conflicts. We do not put off the search for joint solutions to other problems, international, political, and global. However, the first real step in the field of disarmament is of importance. The world is brimming over with problems and what is needed is an active policy on the part of both sides. I am confident that requirements which have, objectively, become pressing, will, in any event, make their way through to politics. This will facilitate an influx into politics of people capable of solving problems. There will be more and more of those who have a serious understanding of the need for a new way of thinking. The understanding of long-term human interests will, more and more, gain the upper hand in world politics, and there will be less and less opportunism, preelection considerations, and the subordination of the greatest problems to the vicissitudes of competition between parties.

Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev stressed the role of small and medium-size countries in the general process of normalizing the international situation. This applies, among other things, to the idea of a nonnuclear zone in northern Europe, whose formation would be an important factor in reducing general tension.

At the request of his collocutor, Mikhail Sergeyvich Gorbachev dwelled on the issues of restructuring in Soviet society. Our idea is simple: to use the economic, political, intellectual and all other kinds of potentials inherent in socialism in order to put dynamism into the society, which is mature enough to receive it and which needs it. We are digging deep, and the process is far from smooth, but it is essential. The alternative is stagnation, which our people does not want and cannot tolerate. The idea of restructuring has not been taken on trust by society, but is based on a serious discussion in the framework of that very openness or glasnost, as you would say in Russian.

Our society is being transformed in that melting pot of impetuous public opinion and active creativeness; a new quality will emerge in a number of years. But that quality will be a superior stage of socialism and nothing else.

We do not have answers to all questions. We accumulate experience, extract lessons from what has been done already, but the chief road has been chosen, and it has been taken up by the party and the people.

Some humanitarian issues and prospects for widening contacts among citizens of various countries with respect to the values prized by each of them, opportunities for regular and competent international talks on topical problems of the modern times, also were discussed.

Mikhail Sergyevich Gorbachev asked the prime minister to convey good wishes to the Islandic people, who are liked all the more in the Soviet Union with regard to the Reykjavik summit. He expressed his satisfaction with the mutual understanding that emerged again in the course of the conversation, just like in Reykjavik.

Hermannsson spoke of the great interest displayed in the West and in Iceland to everything now taking place in the USSR. He wished success to the Soviet leadership. It inspires hope in all of us, he said, for the world has become too pessimistic and grim. It needs to be stimulated by optimism, and you in the USSR are creating such a stimulus, both through the transformations in your country and through staking your success on dialogue, which is needed by the world in order to depart from the difficult situation to the road of cooperation.

Attending the conversation was Ambassador T.A. Tomasson.

Comments on Gorbachev Meeting

AU031021 Paris AFP in English 1013 GMT 3 Mar 87

[Text] Moscow, March 3 (AFP) -- The Soviet Union is soon to allow its citizens "greatly increased freedom" to travel as part of the continuing democratisation process, Icelandic Prime Minister Steingrimur Hermannsson said here Tuesday.

Commenting on a meeting Monday with Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev, Mr. Hermansson told a press conference that Mr. Gorbachev had also said that more political prisoners were to be released, but did not specify individual cases.

The Communist Party general secretary told the Icelandic premier at their two-hour meeting that there was "not long to wait for greatly increased freedom" concerning travel outside the Soviet Union.

It was the first indication that improved travel opportunities were being considered by the Kremlin.

Mr. Hermannsson said he undertsood that "in a few years" there would be "very great changes", and Mr. Gorbachev had stressed that there was "no turning back" from his policy of "glassnost", or openness, which according to the Soviet leader had the support of the people and the party.

At the same time, however, there would be "no deviating from Socialism", and the current reforms would be according to Socialist principles, Mr. Hermannsson quotes that Soviet leader as saying.

Exchanges Views With Ryzhkov

PM041221 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Mar 87 First Edition pp 1, 4

[TASS report: "Soviet-Icelandic Talks"]

[Text] Talks were held in the Kremlin 2 March between Nikolay Ryzhkov, chairman of thre USSR Council of Ministers, and S. Hermannsson, prime minister of Iceland.

Urgent international problems and matters pertaining to Soviet-Icelandic relations were discussed in a constructive spirit and an atmosphere of frankness.

Special attention at the talks was devoted to the new Soviet proposals set forth in the statement by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, on singling out the problem of medium-range missiles in Europe from the package of nuclear disarmament issues and on an early conclusion of a new agreement on that type of weapons.

Those proposals demonstrate the Soviet Union's goodwill and its constructive approach and readiness to seek a solution with the aim of achieving mutually acceptable agreements on nuclear disaramament problems.

Nikolay Ryzhkov dwelt on principled key issues of the program proposed by the Soviet Union for establishing a comprehensive system of international security, stressing that the set of measures envisioned by it and aiming for the complete elimination of nuclear and other types of weapons of mass destruction before the end of the current century opened a realistic road toward resolving international problems of paramount importance and with a view to warding off the threat of a nuclear holocaust from humankind.

That had been confirmed during the meeting between the leaders of the USSR and the U.S. in the capital of Iceland last October -- the meeting that charted the prospect of a nuclear-free world.

The Icelandic side pointed out the importance of the Soviet-U.S. meeting in Reykjavik and expressed hope for a continuation of the Soviet Union's and the United States' efforts accords on k disarmament issues.

Steingrimur Hermannssor gave a positive appraisal of the Soviet Union's new initiative on concluding a separate agreement on the elimination of Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe.

The two sides expressed a firm intention to contribute to strengthening international security and stability, and to seek to curb the arms race. The high responsibility of political figures for the destiny of their countries, of Europe and the world, and the need for joint actions of countries in the name of averting the nuclear threat were spoken of in this regard.

Nikolay Ryzhkov informed Steingrimur Hermannsson of the policy of reorganization, of the deep-going reorganization processes taking place in all area of Soviet life now, and of the results of the January (1987) CPSU Central Committee Plenum.

It was emphasized that the entire work to renew our society is prompted by its vital requirements and by the logic of internal development. The transformations now taking place in the USSR convincingly reaffirm our country's commitment to the cause of peace and international cooperation.

Steingrimur Hermannsson received the information about the internal life in the Soviet Union with much interest, pointing out that the processes taking place in Soviet society are of great importance to all countries in the world, including Iceland. He wished success in the realization of the projected plans.

There was a detailed exchange of opinions on questions of Soviet-Icelandic relations. It was noted with satisfaction that they were given extra impetus by the meeting between M.S. Gorbachev and Iceland's leaders in Reykjavik in October 1986.

The sides advocated the further development of Soviet-Icelandic political dialogue and of trade and economic, scientific and technical, and cultural ties, and the active search for new forms and opportunities for strengthening cooperation.

Confidence was expressed that the visit to the USSR by Prime Minister Steingrimur Hermannsson would serve to strengthen Soviet-Icelandic relations and to deepen mutual understanding between the two countries for the benefit of their peoples, and in the interests of improving the international situation.

Taking part in the talks for the Soviet side were: B.I. Aristov, USSR foreign trade minister; K.F. Katushev, chairman of the State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations; A.G.Kovalev, USSR first deputy foreign minister; and I.N. Krasavin, USSR ambassador to Iceland; and for the Icelandic side: T.A. Tomasson, Icelandic ambassador to the USSR; (G. Benediktsson), head of the prime minister's office; (G. Flovens), director of the Herring Committee; and other officials.

Ryzhkov Dinner Speech

PM041613 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Mar 87 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: N.I. Ryzhkov's Speech"]

[Text] We are pleased to welcome you in the Kremlin today, minister prime minister, your wife and other Icelandic guests, said N.I. Ryzhkov. This visit is being seen in our country, not according to strict protocol but in purely human manner, as a return, in a familiar sense, for the visit to Iceland, in October last year, of M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. [paragraph continues]

As we receive the representatives of the Icelandic Republic in the Soviet Union, we are with the very best sentiments, repaying a debt of hospitality to its leaders and to the citizens of Reykjavik.

This city also has now entered history in a new capacity -- as the place where the prospect of a nonnuclear world was half-opened before mankind. The way to Reykjavik was long and hard. While it has not yet been possible to set about dealing practically with the main task -- moving toward genuine disarmament -- the efforts of many states, peoples, parties, organizations and movements to achieve this aim should, nonetheless, not be regarded as in vain.

At the meeting in the Icelandic capital, the Soviet side introduced unique proposals which embraced the major aspects of disarmament. To a large extent, the considerations of the United States and its allies were taken into account. At the foundation of these, as of many other of the Soviet Union's initiatives, is the new political thinking, our program for setting up a comprehensive system of international security put forward by the 27th CPSU Congress.

On the eve of your visit, the Soviet Union took the decision to make yet another major step down the road toward mutually acceptable accords in the area of nuclear disarmament. In displaying goodwill and a desire to find ways of improving interstate relations in Europe and a real strengthening of its security, we proposed singling out the problem of medium-range missiles in Europe from out of the group of questions, and urgently concluding a separate agreement [soglasheniye] on it.

Taking into account the considerations of NATO's European members, a positive answer also has been given, too, to other questions associated with this: This is the removal from the GDR and the CSSR, by agreement with the governments of those countries, of enhanced-range operational-tactical missiles [operativno-takticheskikh raket povyshennoy dal'nosti], which were sited [razmeshcheny] there as countermeasures to the deployment [razvertyvaniye] of Pershing-2's and cruise missiles in Western Europe. We are also ready to make an immediate start on talks aimed at cutting back and completely eliminating other operational-tactical missiles [drugikh raket operativno-takticheskogo naznacheniya]. In addition to this number, Soviet medium-range missiles in Asia are being cut to 100 warheads, and the same number of warheads on medium-range missiles could be left by the United States on its national territory.

We reckon that Europe is seriously considering the evolving situation, for here is a unique opportunity to act so that our continent ceases to be viewed as a potential theater for nuclear war. This depends not only on the Soviet Union and the United States, but on all European states. We must all act so that concern for the national security of each does not come into conflict with the security interests of all other European countries, so that the one can be combined organically with the other. It is from this premise that our proposal proceeds, and without it there can be no success in applying this historic opportunity.

We would like to hope that Iceland, whose opinion we respect, will evaluate the new Soviet initiative in the appropriate manner.

Throughout their history, Soviet-Icelandic relations have never been clouded by hostility or feuds. Direct diplomatic ties between our countries were established during WW II and this Act embodied the mutual striving of the peoples of the Soviet Union and Iceland for closer cooperation and mutual understanding.

Although thousands of miles of sea lie between our countries, the sea has not separated us, but, on the contrary, has brought us closer. This is all the more true of the present time. A significant volume of Soviet-Icelandic cooperation in trade and economic, scientific and technological, international and legal, and, indeed, in the political spheres, is connected with the sea. There is no need to talk about the enormous significance of the world's ocean -- its living and mineral resources -- for all mankind. But the sea is of special significance for a country such as Iceland. Taking this into account, the Soviet Union viewed with understanding such decisions by Iceland as the establishment of a 50-mile fishing zone and, later, a 200-mile economic zone.

I think that in light of the UN Charter and the Helsinki Final Act, relations between the Soviet Union and Iceland can become an example of relations between states differing not only in territorial size, size of population, and provision of raw materials, but in their social structure and their membership of different military-political alliances, as well. There is a good basis for this -- the principle of peaceful coexistence, the ability to build relations with each other on the basis of equality, mutual respect for sovereignty, and noninterference in internal affairs.

By reason of causes of an objective nature, the following situation has come about in our trade: The main item of Soviet exports to Iceland is petroleum products, especially fuel for the Icelandic fishing fleet. For its part, the Soviet Union buys from Iceland a considerable quantity of marine products.

Our exchange of views today shows that there exists a potential for further developing Soviet-Icelandic trade, for expanding the range of goods which the Soviet Union and Iceland supply each other with. This may be promoted by closer ties in the sphere of industry, science and culture, which also was spoken about during our talks. We are convinced that by joint efforts it will be possible to deepen in a substantial manner friendly contacts in various areas. Both the Soviet and the Icelandic sides can and must do quite a lot so that our peoples get to know each other better -- both through reciprocal cultural intercourse and through contacts in science and creative unions, sports and tourism.

In conclusion, I should like to express confidence that your current visit to the USSR, Mr Prime Minister, will serve to strengthen mutual understanding between our countries and the further development of Soviet-Icelandic relations in the interests of the peoples of the Soviet Union and Iceland and of the cause of peace and international cooperation.

I wish the people of Iceland prosperity and progress, and you, Mr Prime Minister, your wife, and all our Icelandic guests, health and success.

Hermannsson Dinner Address

PM060951 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Mar 87 First Edition p 4

[TASS report under the general heading "In A Friendly Atmosphere" on Icelandic Prime Minister S. Hermannsson's speech at 2 March dinner hosted by USSR Council of Ministers Chairman N.I. Ryzhkov]

[Text] I thank you, Mr Chairman of the Council of Ministers, for this fine reception and particularly for your government's invitation to visit the USSR, the guest said. My talks with you and with the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee were without doubt the main purpose of my visit. I am convinced that they will help to strengthen relations between the USSR and Iceland.

The fundamental principles of our foreign policy is the maintenance of good relations with other peoples. This is how our relations with the USSR have been for decades. The Soviet Union is one of our main trading partners. Although the volume of our trade relations is, of course, not large on the scale of a great power, I would venture to suggest that they are beneficial to the Soviet Union. I hope that our talks will help to further expand trade between our peoples. In this regard, both sides must fully implement the provisions of our framework agreement. I also believe that specialists working in various areas of production and trade should consider new forms of trade relations. I am convinced that in this age of technical progress and the renovation of production there is great potential for this.

We Icelanders believe that the peoples must live in peace. We condemn all violence and believe that all peoples must determine their own fate. A state's army has no business outside that state's boundaries.

In this regard, I would like to express particular satisfaction at our talks today. Mr Chairman. As befits engineers, we conducted those talks openly and sincerely. These talks were undoubtedly beneficial to relations between our peoples.

Unfortunately, the situation in the world has developed in a different spirit since the last world war. The considerable achievements of scientific and technical progress, which could have created good living conditions for the peoples of the world, have been used for military purposes. The nuclear arms race has reached such proportions that the world is now on the edge of the abyss. The peoples are living in fear of nuclear power [energiya], which can destroy life on earth many times over. Things cannot continue that way for long. The great powers must abandon the path that they have been following recently. Nuclear armaments must be substantially reduced and subsequently eliminated. We Icelanders will promote this, although it is obvious that the ability to achieve such a result rests primarily with the great powers.

In this regard, we received with satisfaction the proposal of the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee on holding a meeting between the leaders of the great powers in Iceland last fall.

It was clear to me that this event was of such importance that it could resolve mankind's future. On behalf of the Icelandic Government, I immediately agreed to the holding of that meeting in Reykjavik.

I will not deny that at the end of the meeting I was disappointed. That could be said for many others, too. However, it is now clear to most people that the Reykjavik meeting did more than had initially seemed to be the case. The proposals put forward there formed a basis for the continuation of talks on the reduction and subsequent elimination of nuclear arms. The Reykjavik meeting was an epoch-making event. It gave people fresh hope.

I agree that it is necessary to work for the destruction of nuclear armaments. It is clear that this will take some time and will take place in stages. However, it is necessary to set such a task at the very beginning or else it will not be achieved.

In this context, I should like to express satisfaction at the remarkable proposals on the reduction and elimination of nuclear arms set out by Soviet state leader M.S. Gorbachev in Reykjavik, proposals which have subsequently been confirmed. [paragraph continues.

In particular, the unconditional elimination of medium-range nuclear missiles in Europe was recently proposal. In my view, these proposals can serve as the basis for an agreement that would lead to the complete elimination of nuclear armaments by, for instance, the end of the century.

We in Iceland are proud of our contribution to the process of changing the way people think, which seems to have happened since the Reykjavik meeting. We would like to consolidate this atmosphere and mankind's hopes which it engendered. It would be good if the great powers were to support the idea of creating in Iceland an organization whose purpose would be to help improve mutual relations not only between East and West but also among all the peoples of the world. This would be an organization with the aim of preserving life on earth. We could provide the conditions for conferences and meetings, contacts between people, thought and research, and everything that would be considered necessary for that purpose.

There are many other problems in the world that could be resolved by the peoples' unity and cooperation. I would mention here the pollution or even the destruction of the environment -- biologically and through the pollution of the land, sea, and atmosphere. The protection of all life on earth is an urgent task.

I sincerely hope that the broadening of mutual understanding and trust among the peoples and individuals of all nationalities is the most likely and perhaps the only way to improve relations between countries. In this regard, permit me to welcome those changes taking place in the Soviet Union. Your mighty people have nothing to fear from other peoples, and I am convinced that the USSR's position will be further strengthened thanks to the broadening of its citizens' freedoms, including the opportunity to express their own opinions and to go wherever they choose.

The Soviet Union's history is highly instructive. Peter the Great's opening up of the country to advanced thought and its adoption of the path of progress were milestones of epoch-making significance. Periods of stagnation and sometimes even regression have since been recorded. In an incredibly short time, the USSR has not only attempted to eliminate these negative processes, but also has tranformed itself into one of the most powerful states in the world. I believe that you are again experiencing a period of epoch-making significance in your history.

The scientific and technical revolution is gaining momentum. It is based on each person's spirit of freedom. The country which urges its citizens to enjoy freedom and creative thinking adapts best to this process. I wish the Soviet Union great success in this area.

If advanced experience is used correctly, there is no reason for pessimism about mankind's fate. On the contrary, there is every reason for optimism.

In conclusion, I would like to express again my gratitude for the invitation to pay an official visit to your country and I hope that it will help to further strengthen the good mutual relations between our peoples. Once again I confirm the invitation to you, Mr Chairman of the Council of Ministers, to visit Iceland.

The Prime Minister spoke in favor of peace and the improvement of living conditions on earth and the improvement of mutual relations between the Soviet Union and Iceland.

News Conference 3 Mar

LD031301 Moscow TASS in English 1241 GMT 3 Mar 87

[Text] Moscow March 3 TASS -- The latest Soviet proposals for the elimination of short- and medium-range missiles from Europe were discussed at the Icelandic-Soviet talks in Moscow, Icelandic Prime Minister Steingrimur Hermannsson told a press conference here today.

"We also discussed many aspects of such a first step to the complete elimination of nuclear weapons. We also discussed the very interesting things that are taking place in the Soviet Union, which aroused very great interest all over the world and also in my country."

Answering questions from correspondents, the prime minister said that a nuclear weapon-free zone was very much discussed and that Icelandic Parliament passed a resolution in May 1984.

"It states, in short, that nuclear weapons shall not be allowed on Icelandic soil, and this has always been our policy, and that such a nuclear-free zone should stretch from the Urals to Greenland."

"It actually seems to me," the prime minister continued, "that the new proposal for eliminating all short- and medium-range missiles from the whole of Europe goes even further and is of even greater importance.

People are now after Reykjavik and after the Soviet proposal of 15th January 1986 for the first time talking seriously of the complete elimination of nuclear weapons.

The Soviet proposal is very positive and without any conditions, (such as linkage) with SDI, [punctuation as received] and this would be a very important first step towards the total and complete elimination of nuclear weapons."

Answering a question from a Danish correspondent about the U.S. military base in Keflavik, Hermannsson explained that the base had been established "only for keeping track of what was going on in and over the north Atlantic," and added that the Icelanders "would be the first ones to be very pleased if no foreign bases were necessary in any country of the world."

"I'm very firmly of the opinion that the only reliable basis is greater confidence between people," the prime minister said. "Other things necessary at the present time are to keep the balance... It will have to be carefully considered and this of course includes conventional weapons. While we have not reached the ultimate stage of confidence we have to rely on the balance in conventional weapons."

The prime minister also outlined the economic talks he had had in Moscow and prospects for the development of bilateral economic relations, in particular, in the food industry, fishing, shipbuilding and electronics.

'Completely Satisfied' With Talks

PM051517 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 4 Mar 87 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Complete Satisfaction"]

[Text] Icelandic Prime Minister S. Hermannsson told a news conference for Soviet and foreign correspondents held on 3 March at the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs press center that he is completely satisfied with the talks and meetings he had in Moscow during his official visit.

An important place in my conversation with M.S. Gorbachev, the prime minister said, was given over to discussing the results of the summit meeting in Reykjavik. We regard it as a very major event in the task of further strengthening peace on earth. The Soviet Union's current proposal to eliminate medium-range missiles in Europe reflects the spirit of Reykjavik and could become the first real step along the road to nuclear disarmament. Everyone must take it seriously. There must be a nuclear-free zone from Iceland to the Urals.

Regarding the specific results of the talks, the guest noted that they reaffirmed the intention of Iceland and the Soviet Union to expand and deepen bilateral relations. He stressed the importance of trade accords in this respect. Iceland will continue to export herring and import oil products. The sides also discussed questions of cooperation in the sphere of technological development and the formation of joint enterprises.

In conclusion, the prime minister wished the Soviet Union success and progress.

Journalists' questions were answered.

On the same day, S. Hermannsson visited the USSR Academy of Sciences Space Research Institute.

Raisa Gorbachev Hosts Lunch

LD021522 Moscow TASS in English 1514 GMT 2 Mar 87

[Text] Moscow March 2 TASS -- Raisa Gorbacheva today gave a luncheon in honour of the wife of Steingrimur Hermannsson, prime minister of Iceland, visiting the USSR on an official visit. She accompanied Gorbacheva during her stay in Reykjavik. Attending the luncheon was also Lyudmila Ryzhkova, wife of the head of the Soviet Government.

Seen off at Airport

PM051244 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Mar 87 First Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Departure From the Soviet Union"]

[Text] Icelandic Prime Minister S. Hermannsson and his wife left Moscow 3 March. He was in our country on an official visit at the invitation of the Soviet Government.

He was seen to the plane at Sheremetyevo Airport by N.I. Ryzhkov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Poltiburo and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and his wife, V.S. Murakhovskiy, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and other officials.

The state flags of Iceland and the Soviet Union were raised at the airport. An honor guard of troops from the Moscow garrison was drawn up on the runway. A band played the two countries' state anthems.

N.I. Ryzhkov and S. Hermannsson inspected the Soviet servicemen.

The send-off ceremony ended with a march-past by the honor guard.

The two countries' state flags and greetings banners decked the streets and squares that the motorcade, accompanied by an honor escort of motorcyclists, passed through on the way to the airport.

Copenhagen News Conference

LD051045 Moscow TASS in English 0918 GMT 5 Mar 87

[Text] Copenhagen March 5 TASS -- The conversation with Mikhail Gorbachev has convinced me of the absolute seriousness of the Soviet leader's proposal that medium-range missiles be withdrawn from Europe.

This was stated by Prime Minister of Iceland Steingrimur Hermannsson at a press conference in the Danish capital. He arrived there upon completion of his official visit to the USSR.

The head of the Icelandic Government underlined the Soviet Union's readiness to get down right away to negotiations on tactical missiles. He said that the question of establishing a nuclear-free zone in the north of Europe had also been discussed with Mikhail Gorbachev.

The Soviet leader, he said, expressed understanding of Iceland's opinion that such a zone should embrace a territory from the Urals to Greenland. The general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee stressed it was very important that the idea of a nuclear-free zone in the north of the European continent be backed by as many countries of the region as possible.

IZVESTIYA DECRIES TURKISH HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES

PM051505 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Mar 87 Morning Edition p 3

[I. Leonidov article: "How They Treat Dissidents," under the rubric "On the Human Rights Question"]

[Text] Recently, reports on the country's gross violations of human rights have started to appear more and more frequently in the Turkish press. These violations arouse the indignation of Turkish public opinion, which demands the declaration of an amnesty for political prisoners, recognition of the workers' right to strike, and a halt to torture in prisons and the persecution of dissidents. The recent debate in the Turkish parliament on the budget for 1987 developed into stormy exchanges on the problems of human rights and democratization. [paragraph continues]

In a number of deputies' speeches, the growing wave of clericalism in the country and serious faults in the spheres of education and social security were pointed out. In this way, many of the burning topics of the day that the Turkish press has long been writing about, demanding their solution, already have been voiced openly in parliament as well. There are about 4 million unemployed in the country. In the large cities, the mass of people live in poverty in slums. The process of destroying peasant farms is intensifying, as a result of which the size of the rural population is constantly decreasing. Correspondingly, the sector of declasse elements in the cities, "black market" traders, and emigre workers is on the increase. State expenditure on social needs and public health is decreasing and military appropriations are steadily climbing -- in recent years they have increased several times over.

It is not surprising that in such conditions the authorities have taken all measures to prevent workers' organized demonstrations for their rights. Strikes and any other demonstrations actually are banned. Activists of the DISK trade union association have been on trial for many years. By a court decision of 24 December 1986, more than 200 leaders of this almost million-strong democratic trade union organization, disbanded after the 1980 coup, were sentenced to long -- up to 15 years -- terms of imprisonment.

The trial of members of the Turkish society of peace supporters continues. They have been charged with the standard "attempts to undermine the existing regime." In this way, the struggle for peace and for workers' rights is regarded as an "activity contravening local laws and undermining the country's existing customs."

Recently, the CUMHURIYET and TERCUMAN newspapers reported that 109 representatives of the Turkish intelligentsia submitted a petition demanding the democratization of the country's systems and an end to persecution for political convictions. Appeals by a whole series of famous political figures, writers, and lawyers demanding an end to torture in prisons and announcing an amnesty for political prisoners -- numbering, it is estimated, tens of thousands -- also have been published.

As REUTER reported from Ankara a few days ago, at least 149 people died in torture chambers in the period after the 1980 revolution, many of them as a result of torture. The news agency cites the words of one Turkish lawyer that, as before, torture is being carried out using electric current and other extreme methods. The government, in REUTER's words, admits to individual instances of police and prison authorities taunting prisoners, but denies that torture is practiced systematically. Under public pressure, the Turkish authorities nonetheless have been forced to set up a special parliamentary commission to examine the torture issue. Proceedings were instituted against more than 5,000 people accused of inhumane treatment of detainees.

Reports by the Turkish press on the violation of human rights are extremely sketchy as a result of tough censorship curbs. In recent years, in the estimation of Western journalists, their Turkish colleagues have been sentenced to a total of 300 years or so for violating these restrictions. In addition to this, the authorities are practicing the periodic closure of local press publications for an indefinite period.

The list of facts of the violation of human rights could be continued. Progressive circles in Europe and on other continents condemn the Turkish authorities' antidemocratic actions.

PERES' REQUEST TO VISIT MOSCOW 'REJECTED'

LD070949 Kuwait KUNA in English 0815 GMT 7 Mar 87

[Text] Kuwait, March 7 (KUNA) -- The Soviet Union has rejected a request by Israeli Deputy Premier and Foreign Minister Shimon Peres to visit Moscow, according to a Kuwaiti daily Saturday.

Daily AL-QABAS, quoting what it described as well-informed Western European sources as saying that the Soviet Union refused to extend an invitation to Peres at the present circumstances.

The sources revealed that the Israeli official sent his request through two channels. One was through the direct Israeli-Soviet contacts carried out in several capitals, and the other was through a Western country that has strong ties with Moscow and Tel Aviv.

The sources said Peres informed Soviet officials that he wants to visit Moscow as soon as possible to discuss with officials there three major topics including: The convention of a proposed international peace conference on the Arab-Israeli conflict and the Soviet Union's role in this conference, the possibility of resuming diplomatic ties between Moscow and Tel Aviv, which were severed since the war of 1967 and opening the way for the immigration of Soviet Jews to Israel.

The Western sources affirmed to AL-QABAS that the Soviet officials refused to accept the Israeli minister's request and informed him that the time is not appropriate for Peres or any other senior Israeli official to visit the Soviet capital.

The Soviet officials also told Peres that the exchange of high level visits between the two parties cannot be seriously implemented until the convention of the international peace conference and when Israel takes tangible steps that express its readiness to withdraw from the occupied Arab territories and secure the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people to live in peace.

The daily learnt from European sources that in spite of the Soviet rejection, there are continuous contacts between Soviet and Israeli diplomats in several capitals, which included Washington, Paris and Geneva.

Meanwhile, American sources, which AL-QABAS described as well-informed, told the daily that there is a big and serious possibility that the Soviet leadership will take new measures during the next two months to allow a large number of Soviet Jews to leave the Soviet Union to Israel or to any other country they desire to immigrate to.

ECONOMIC COOPERATION PROTOCOL SIGNED WITH SYRIA

LD051809 Moscow TASS in English 1735 GMT 5 Mar 87

[Text] Moscow March 5 TASS -- Prospects for the development of business contacts between the Soviet Union and Syria in oil prospecting and mining in 1987 were discussed at the 14th meeting of the oil industry subcommission of the permanent Soviet-Syrian Commission for Economic, Scientific and Technological Cooperation, which closed here today.

A protocol signed on the results of the meeting envisions that the organizations of the two countries will jointly develop new oil and gas fields in Syria, in particular, the Said-Zurab and el-Hol deposits. Contracts on these projects are going to be concluded in the second half of 1987.

The partners will continue oil prospecting and geophysical studies at oil fields. Soviet organizations will supply equipment, materials and spares for the development and operation of existing oil fields.

The sides discussed prospects for the participation of Soviet specialists in comprehensive surveys for hydrocarbons in Syria, and also the possibility of drilling deep wells with heavy drilling rigs in Syrian territory.

On the same day the Soviet Tsvetmetpromexport Association and Syria's General Company for Phosphate and Mines signed a protocol on cooperation in the development of Syria's phosphate mining industry. Under the protocol, Soviet organizations will draw up a master plan for phosphate mining. A contract to this effect will be concluded in the near future.

ENVOY RECEIVED BY SYRIAN VICE PRESIDENT

LD040955 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0900 GMT 4 Mar 87

[Text] Khaddam, vice president of Syria, has received Sidenko, special Soviet representative and ambassador at large in Damascus. During their conversation, which took place in a businesslike and friendly atmosphere, there was discussion of Soviet-Syrian cooperation, the international situation, and the situation in the Near East. There was also a meeting between Al-Shar', the Syrian foreign minister, and the Soviet representative.

CULTURAL COOPERATION PLAN SIGNED WITH IRAQ

PM081723 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 Mar 87 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report: "In the Interests of Mutual Understanding"]

[Text] Baghdad, 5 Mar -- A plan for cultural and scientific cooperation between the USSR and Iraq in 1987-88 was signed here today. The document envisages exchanges of delegations of scientists, education and enlightenment workers, cinematographers, artists, and writers. Cooperation between the two countries' higher educational establishments will expand. It is also planned to coordinate the efforts of Soviet and Iraqi specialists in the study of Russian in Iraqi educational establishemmts and to exchange literature and textbooks.

IZVESTIYA REPORTS CAIRO GULF WAR SEMINAR

PM061057 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 Feb 87 Morning Edition p 5

[Report by special correspondent V. Skosyrev: "Still a Blind Tunnel; International Forum in Cairo Has Called for an Immediate Ceasefire on the Iran-Iraq Front"]

[Text] Cairo-Moscow -- It seems that President Kennedy was the first to think of comparing the position of an army bogged down in a protracted war with the feeling experienced by someone in a dark tunnel. If we apply this metaphor to the fighting on the Iran-Iraq front, which has continued unbabated for over 6 years, it may be said that last week a feeble light began to glimmer at the end of the tunnel. Or so it might seem, at any rate, inasmuch as Baghdad has announced the cessation of its air attacks on cities for a period of 14 days while Tehran has promised to act "in a similar way."

Does this step mean that the warring sides are not seeking the further escalation of the conflict? As far as Iraq is concerned, its government has clearly stated its readiness for a ceasefire and talks. These proposals are meeting with no response in Tehran. Nor is Tehran reacting to the mediation efforts which have frequently been undertaken by the United Nations, the nonaligned movement, the Islamic Conference Organization, and other international organizations.

Foreign correspondents, with only occasional access to the front, draw a rather contradictory picture of the hostilities. As a whole they agree that Iraq has superiority in the air and Iran on the ground. After the bomb raids on population centers had been suspended, Iran attacked the Iraqi defense line 12 km from the port of Basra and shelled it.

In brief, the lull was short-lived. The tragedy which, according to some figures, has already left about 1 million people dead or crippled, is continuing. That is why the initiative of the AAPSO and the WPC, which recently convened the international seminar "for the cessation of the Iran-Iraq war" in Cairo is timely and useful. The forum was very representative -- taking part were the envoys of several dozen states and various international organizations. The importance the Arab world attached to the meeting is borne out by the fact that Egyptian President H. Mubarak and Iraqi President S. Husayn sent messages to the seminar. On the other hand, the seminar could serve as an illustration of the difficulties which have to be overcome. Iranian representatives did not take part in it, although an invitation was sent to Tehran. Nor were there representatives in Cairo of the public organizations of countries like Syria and Libya which play a prominent part in opposing imperialism in the Near East.

In brief, the people who gathered in the Sheraton Hotel concert hall on the banks of the Nile had an opportunity to see for themsleves what a pernicious influence war has on the unity of the nonaligned movement and the Arab peoples. Hence the delegates' desire to analyze the underlying reasons for the conflict and to expose the forces which are publicly proclaiming strict neutrality but are secretly pouring oil on the fire of confrontation. Actually, no differences were revealed on this latter issue. The "Irangate" scandal revealed the interference of the United States, Israel, and indeed of a number of West European NATO countries in the conflict.

But of course simply establishing the facts is not enough. What are the motive springs of U.S. policy? What place do the Persian Gulf countries occupy in it? -- those are the problems which were the focus of attention of those taking part in the discussion. To sum up their statements, we can draw the following conclusions.

Washington views events in the region through the prism of its own global strategy. The natural resources of the Persian Gulf, which accounts for about one-third of world oil extraction, occupy a considerable place in its calculations. But, of course, it is not only a case of oil. From the viewpoint of the U.S. Government, the importance of this zone is determined primarily by the fact that it is situated at the crossroads of sea routes and in the immediate vicinity of the Soviet Union's borders. It is not for nothing that the Pentagon's secret document outlining plans for 1984-88 frankly states that U.S. Armed Forces should be ready to occupy positions in this region at their own initiative without waiting for "an invitation from friendly governments." Here first use of nuclear weapons and their subsequent use are envisaged.

It is natural to ask: What bearing does this directive have on the Iran-Iraq war? A direct bearing. As the eminent Egyptian public figure Murad Ghal'ib pointed out, the conflict has enabled the United States and its strategic ally Israel to wear down both sides which could make a great contribution to the opposition to Israeli expansion.

Here Iran, inasmuch as its armed forces are supplied with mainly American equipment, is very vulnerable to outside pressure. The longer the war lasts, the more powerfully the need will grow for spare parts and additions to this equipment and that means the more frequently the Iranian leaders, despite their hostility toward the "great Satan," will be obliged to appeal to him. All this will make it easier for Washington to look for "moderates" among the Iranian leadership on whom President Reagan has gambled in sanctioning the sale of arms to Tehran. The ultimate goal of this game is to return Iran to the orbit of U.S. strategy, as was the case under the shah. The United States succeeded in removing Egypt from the anti-iumperialist front primarily with the aid of the Camp David deal and it is "hoping to explode the Iranian revolution from within," by exploiting the gulf war, M. Ghal'ib concludes.

The trouble is that this conflict is intensifying the split in the Arab world. It is not merely that some Arab states have supported Iraq and others Iran. The continuation of the war (and on Iran's side it is being waged to slogans of the extension of Islamic rule) threatens to further destabilize the situation within neighboring states and even in Egypt. It is perhaps only when you visit Egypt, where feelings of Muslim extremism are heated by the flagrant social inequality, that you begin to understand how keenly people there interpret events on the Iran-Iraq front..

The report delivered by the public figure Bahij Nassar was highly indicative on this plane. In his opinion Tehran is seeking not only to overthrow the regime existing in Iraq. Its main task is to create a "great Islamic nation" including Egypt where life would be regulated by the rules of the Sharj'at.

Of course, it is possible to say that the speaker's fears are exaggerated. But the harsh truth is that the hotbed of armed antagonism in such a sensitive spot in the world where different religions and cultures meet could assume uncontrollable dimensions. [paragraph continues]

How to extinguish it? The leader of the Egyptian Liberal Socialist Party who attended the seminar suggested creating Arab armed formations which could separate the warring sides. This statement failed to meet with approval. The majority of the speakers noted that attempts to organize military groupings, whatever the motives guiding their initiators, will only play into the hands of the imperialists, who are always ready to give "aid" in the form of arms deliveries to the Persian Gulf states in order to step up their own influence on their policy.

A real way out of the critical situation, the participants in the seminar said, can only be found on the path of an immediate ceasefire, on the path of negotiations. They should be based on the principles of noninterference in each other's internal affairs and respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity and the withdrawal of troops to internationally recognized borders and the exchange of prisoners of war should also be envisaged.

It is not hard to note that the concluding document of the Cairo meeting has a lot in common with the call to transfer the Iran-Iraq conflict to the channel of the peaceful solutions with which the Soviet Union came out in January. This coincidence is perfectly natural inasmuch as our country has frequently demonstrated the readiness to render assistance to any honest and constructive efforts with a view to ending the carnage.

It is essential to seek a political settlement, guided by the interests of the peoples of Iraq and Iran, and the norm of morality and humanism which proclaim human life to be the supreme value.

REPORTAGE ON ETHIOPIAN DEFENSE MINISTER'S VISIT

Arrives, Meets With Sokolov

PM081359 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 3 Mar 87 First Edition p 1

[Unattributed report: "On an Official Visit"]

[Text] On 2 March Lieutenant General Tesfaye Gebre-Kidan, member of the Worker's Party of Ethiopia [WPE] Central Committee Politburo and minister of national defense of Socialist Ethiopia arrived in the Soviet Union on an official visit at the invitation of Marshal of the Soviet Union S.L. Sokolov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR defense minister.

At Sheremetyevo airport the guest and his party were welcomed by Marshal of the Soviet Union S.L. Sokolov, USSR defense minister; Army General P.G. Lushev, USSR first deputy defense minister; Marshal of Aviaton A.N. Yefimov, USSR deputy defense minister; and generals, admirals, and officers of the Soviet Armed Forces.

Also in the welcoming party were Comrade Asrat Wolde, Ethiopian ambassador to the Soviet Union, and Colonel T. Dellensau, military attache at the Ethiopian Embassy in the USSR.

The state flags of Socialist Ethiopia and the Soviet Union were hoisted at the airport, an honor guard was lined up, and the two countries' state anthems were played.

Lieutenant General Tesfaye Gebre-Kidan, minister of national defense of Socialist Ethiopia, received the report of the commander of the honor guard and inspected the lineup of Soviet servicemen.

On the same day Lieutenant General Tesfaye Gebre-Kidan, minister of national defense of Socialist Ethiopia, laid wreaths at the V.I. Lenin Mausoleum and the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier by the Kremlin Wall. The wreath-laying ceremony was attended by Colonel General V.M. Arkhipov, commander of the Moscow Military District troops.

On 2 March a meeting was held between Marshal of the Soviet Union S.L. Sokolov, USSR defense minister, and Lieutenant General Tesfaye Gebre-Kidan, minister of national defense of Socialist Ethiopia. In the course of a warm and friendly conversation questions of mutual interest were discussed.

Taking part in the conversation were:

On the Soviet side Army General P.G. Lushev, USSR first deputy defense minister; Army General Ye.F. Ivanovskiy, USSR deputy defense minister and commander in chief of the Ground Forces; Marshal of Aviation A.N. Yefimov, USSR deputy defense minister and commander in chief of the Air Force; Marshal of the Soviet Union S.K. Kurkotkin, USSR deputy defense minister and commander of the USSR Armed Forces Rear Services; and other officials.

On the Ethiopian side Major General Abebe Wolde-Mariam, deputy minister of national defense for finance and rear services; Major General Fanta Belai, commander of the Air Force and Air Defense; Major General Hailu Gebre Mikael, commander of the Ground Forces; Rear Admiral Tesfaye Berhanu, commander of the Navy; and other officials.

Marshal of the Soviet Union S.L. Sokolov gave a dinner in honor of Lieutenant General Tesfaye Gebre-Kidan.

Holds Talks With Aliyev

LD061728 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1515 GMT 6 Mar 87

[Text] Comrade Aliyev, Member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, has received today Lieutenant General Gebre Kidan Tesfaye, member of the Worker's Party of Ethiopia Central Committee Political Bureau, minister of national defense of Socialist Ethiopia, who is staying today in the USSR on an official friendly visit.

Comrade Aliyev briefed the guest from Ethiopia about the decisions of the January 1987 plenum of the CPSU Central Committee on the implementation of the party strategic policy of restructuring and social and economic acceleration. The attention of the guest was drawn to the fundamental evaluations and conclusions contained in the speech of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee at the International Forum on a nuclear free world and the survival of mankind.

The Ethiopian Minister has expressed full support for the USSR Foreign policy and in particular, for the new constructive initiatives which were put forward in the statement of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev on 28 February.

The sides expressed satisfaction over the successful development of bilateral relations and favor their further consolidation. The significance of close friendly ties between the CPSU and the Worker's Party of Ethiopia was particularly stressed. Some other issues of mutual interest were discussed.

The conversation which passed in a warm and friendly atmosphere was attended by Marshal of the Soviet Union Sergey Sokolov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, USSR minister of defense, and Asrat Wolde, member of the Workers's Party of Ethiopia Central Committee, ambassador of Socialist Ethiopia to the USSR.

Ends Visit, Departs 9 Mar

LD091057 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0900 GMT 9 Mar 87

[Text] Lieutenant General Tesfaye Gebre Kidan, member of the WPE Central Committee Politburo and minister of defense of socialist Ethiopia, left the Soviet Union for home today. He has been in our country on an official visit at the invitation of the USSR minister of defense.

At the airport the eminent visitor and those accompanying him were seen off by Marshal of the Soviet Union Comrade Sokolov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR minister of the defense, and by other officials. Also, among those seeing him off was Wolde Asrat, ambassador of socialist Ethiopia in the USSR.

FURTHER REPORTAGE ON YELTSIN IN NICARAGUA, CUBA

Meets Castro; Departs Cuba

FL060309 Havana Television Service in Spanish 0100 GMT 6 Mar 87

[Announcer-read report over video showing Castro embracing Yeltsin before the Soviet delegation departs]

[Text] Commander in Chief Fidel Castro, first secretary of the Communist Party of Cuba and president of the Councils of State and Ministers, this afternoon accompanied to the airport Boris Yeltsin, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of the Moscow City committee of the CPSU.

Yeltsin and his delegation stopped over in Havana and during that time they had a lively meeting with the chief of the revolution. Some of the members of the Soviet delegation are V.N. Poletskov, president of the executive committee of the Soviet province of (Kremoble); G.A. Yagodin, member of the CPSU Central Committee and minister of higher and secondary specialized education; A.D. Shalapkova, worker from Minsk; V. Andreyev, deputy chief of the international department of the USSR Supreme Soviet; V. Kazimirov, chief of the first Latin American Department of the Soviet Foreign Ministry; and (V.A. Kurim), official from the international department of the CPSU Central Committee.

Fidel wished the high-level delegation a good flight as they departed for Moscow after fulfilling an official and friendly visit to Nicaragua.

Yakovlev Meets Yeltsin

LD070004 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1515 GMT 6 Mar 87

[Text] The delegation of the USSR Supreme Soviet headed by Comrade Yeltsin, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, first secretary of the CPSU City party committee, has returned to Moscow. The delegation was staying in Nicaragua from 2 to 5 March at the invitation of the National Assembly of the republic. On the way home the Soviet delegation stopped over in Cuba. At the airport, in Moscow, the delegation was met by Comrade Yakovlev, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; Comrade Ryuytel, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; and other official figures.

IZVESTIYA on Matagalpa Visit

PM061431 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 5 Mar 87 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Stay in Nicaragua"]

[Text] Matagalpa, 4 Mar -- The USSR Supreme Soviet delegation headed by B.N. Yeltsin, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, member of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and first secretary of the Moscow CPSU Gorkom, which is in Nicaragua on an official friendly visit, has visited Matagalpa -- the country's northwestern department. [paragraph continues]

In its valleys peasants grow rice, corn, vegetables, and fruit, while vast coffee plantations extend over the mountain slopes.

Its proximity to Honduras has determined the difficult destiny of Matagalpa, whose northern zones are subjected to attacks by U.S. mercenaries. This department suffers the greatest destruction and the biggest casualties among the civilian population. Peasant cooperatives and private farms in Matagalpa have risen to the struggle against Somozist gangs. Together with the Sandinist People's Army they have cleared many regions of contras -- which has made it possible to gather in a good crop of coffee, the republic's chief export product, this year.

The guests from the USSR visited "La Fundadora," a progressive state coffee-growing enterprise, where a rally was held.

The head of the Soviet delegation conveyed fraternal greetings and best wishes in work and struggle to the assembled people. The purpose of our visit, he emphasized, is to further strengthen friendship and cooperation between the peoples of the USSR and Nicaragua and to familiarize ourselves with how the revolutionary people are struggling and working.

People's power in Nicaragua, B.N. Yeltsin said, is just over 7 years old. People's power in the Soviet Union is 70 years old. The path of the Sandinist revolution is a difficult one. Enemies do not allow the Nicaraguan people to work freely and build a peaceful life. The revolution has done a great deal for the working people; it could have done still more except for the aggression unleased by the United States. After the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution imperialist forces launched armed intervention with the aim of preventing us from reviving the country. At that time no one could help us to repulse aggression. Our people vanquished internal counterrevolution and external intervention. Today all the world's progressive forces, including the Soviet Union, are on the side of the Nicaraguan people's courageous struggle.

Soviet people, the delegation leader pointed out, have feelings of sincere respect and liking for the Nicaraguans. They voice solidarity with their desire to defend their sovereignty, independence, and the right to self-determination. We are sure the Nicaraguan people will put an end to aggression and throw the contras off their land.

Friends of the Nicaraguan people cannot fail to be indignant at the undisguised attempts by imperialism and its mercenaries to stifle the people's revolution and to use bullets in Nicaragua to instill their own "order," which the Nicaraguans resolutely reject.

The rally was addressed by President Daniel Ortega of Nicaragua, who accompanied the Soviet delegation. Relations between the Soviet Union and Nicaragua, he said, are founded on the principles of mutual respect, independence, self-determination, and national sovereignty. It is quite clear why friendly relations have been established between our countries. When the U.S. Administration sent its mercenaries to Nicaragua to mine ports and blow up oil storage tanks, the Soviet people were the first to come to our assistance. When the United States stopped deliveries of foodstuffs and industrial goods to Nicaragua, imposing a trade embargo, the Soviet Union again extended to the Nicaraguan people a fraternal helping hand. Relations between our countries are founded on respect for each other and sincere friendship. At the same time as the United States is infiltrating gangs of mercenaries into our country for acts of terrorism, Soviet brothers have sent us their tractors, motor vehicles, grain, and oil. If the United States wants to improve relations with our people, it should behave like the Soviet people, D. Ortega pointed out.

As long as the U.S. Administration adheres to its former policy and wages an unjust, illegal, terrorist war against the Nicaraguan people, there can be no question of improved relations between our countries. The United States will not succeed in bringing Nicaragua to its knees through sabotage, destruction of civilian targets, or murders of peaceful peasants. The U.S. mercenaries are suffering defeat and will be utterly routed.

D. Ortega expressed the support of the Nicaraguan people, the Sandinist National Liberation Front, and the republic's government for the Soviet Union's new peace initiatives to eliminate medium-range missiles in Europe. The specific proposal put to the United States by the USSR is perfectly realistic and designed to strengthen peace, he emphasized.

The president expressed Nicaragua's readiness to resume peaceful dialogue with the U.S. Administration with a view to finding a political solution to the Central American crisis. Despite the numerous internal political problems currently being experienced by the U.S. Administration and the American people, Washington's ruling circles are continuing to gamble on a military invasion of Nicaragua. Under these conditions, the Nicaraguan leader pointed out, we must strengthen vigilance, defense capability, and discipline and enhance production efficiency. Nicaraguans must be ready to repeal any armed intervention, be it an army of mercenaries or of U.S. troops, and must defend every inch of their motherland to the last drop of blood.

The USSR Supreme Soviet delegation toured Matagalpa Department, visited an agricultural produce processing factory under construction at Sebaco with Bulgarian assistance, and talked with workers, peasants, fighters of the Sandinist People's Army, milicianos [militia], and internationalists helping the Nicaraguan people to harvest coffee.

The Soviet parliamentarians familiarized themselves with a children's preschool establishment and with housing construction on the "La Fundadora" farm.

NICARAGUA TO REMAIN ACTIVE IN NONALIGNED MOVEMENT

LD081338 Moscow TASS in English 1231 GMT 8 Mar 87

[Text] Managua March 8 TASS -- Nicaragua will further remain an active participant in the Nonaligned Movement and make every effort for the settlement of the developing countries' political and socio-economic problems. A statement to this effect was made at a press conference on Sunday by Victor Hugo Tinoco, Nicaragua's foreign minister [as received].

Nonalignment, he said, is an inseparable part of Nicaragua's policy in accordance with the basic principles of the Sandinist revolution. In the conditions of the unfair economic order in the capitalist world, the economic problems of the nonaligned countries increasingly sharpen.

In recent years, Victor Hugo Tinoco noted, relations between the Latin American states and the USA have dramatically sharpened as a result of toughening of Washington's expansionist policy, which is aimed at deriving additional profit from the exploitation of the developing states' natural wealth.

The Nicaraguan deputy foreign minister stressed that the Latin American peoples will never accept a settlement of the foreign debt problem through a worsening of the position of the population and a decline in the living standards of the mass of the working people. Therefore Nicaragua will further actively work together with all the countries members of the Nonaligned Movement for establishing a new international economic order and actively contributing to hammering out a common stand of the Latin American states on the issue of resolving the foreign debt problem.

HAVANA HOLDS EXHIBITION ON U.S. ROLE IN NICARAGUA

PM271237 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Feb 87 First Edition p 4

[Own correspondent P. Bogomolov dispatch: "Nicaragua Will Win"]

[Text] Havana, 25 Feb — The exhibition that opened yesterday in Havana's largest exhibition hall was crowded and at the same time quiet. The visitors examined with rapt attention the evidence of Washington's undeclared war against revolutionary Nicaragua.

The organizer of the exhibition -- the Sandinist People's Army Political Directorate -- had brought more than the spoils of war to Havana. There were also numerous propaganda leaflets concocted according to CIA and USIA recipes and dropped by the ragtag "contra" army in the country's northern departments. These leaflets have it all -- exhortations, curses, promises...

"Pay attention to the terrible statistics of crimes against our republic," Colonel Hugo Torres Jiminez of the Sandinist People's Army, who opened the exhibition, said. "The aggression has already cost Nicaraguans 38,000 casualties. Some 9,000 children hve been orphaned. The material losses are equivalent to 10 years' worth of Nicaraguan export earnings."

Fortunately there is another dynamic — the growing power of the strikes against "contra" formations. In the first 2 months of this year the mercenaries' losses have amounted to 935 killed or wounded. The defenders of the new Nicaragua are true to their combat slogan emblazoned on the front of the Havana exhibition: "Sandino Lives!"

ZHUKOV REPLACED AS PEACE COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN

LD061734 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1624 GMT 6 Mar 87

[Text] Moscow, 6 Mar (TASS) -- Today a session of the Soviet Peace Committee Presidium took place, at which practical tasks in the immediate period were discussed. The question of organization was also examined. Georgiy Zhukov was released from the duties of chairman of the Soviet Peace Committee. The Presidium expressed gratitude to him for his many years of work in the post of chairman and his great contribution to the development of the Soviet peace movement. The writer Genrikh Borovik was elected chairman of the Soviet Peace Committee. Anatoliy Dobrynin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, took part in the session.

MVD OFFICER DISCOUNTS CLAIMS OF YOUTH RAMPAGES

PM081849 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 4 Mar 87 First Edition p 6

[F. Gutiontov interview with Militia Major General V. Goncharov, deputy chief of the USSR MVD Main Criminal Investigation Administration, under the rubric "Hearsay.... But What Are the Facts?": "Myth Created About 'Lyubery'"; first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] Our correspondent talked with Militia Major General V. Goncharov, deputy chief of the USSR MVD Main Criminal Investigation Administration:

[Gutiontov] Viktor Vasilyevich, is it true that there were clashes between informal groups in Moscow last Sunday? Or at least attempts, shall we say, at clashes?

[Goncharov] No, there were no clashes on 1 March. I say this quite categorically.

[Gutiontov] But you are aware what prompted the question?

[Goncharov] "Lyubery"?

[Gutiontov] Quite so. A great deal has been said on the subject recently. The editorial office is receiving letters, telephone calls.... Readers want to know: What is really happening? What we are talking about here is teenagers from the city of Lyubertsy near Moscow who "limber up" in informal fitness clubs and then come to the capital in droves and literally terrorize other teenagers. Each rumor is worse than the last....

[Goncharov] I will say right now the the "Lyubertsy percentage" of the total number of crimes committed in Moscow by teenagers is very insignificant.

[Gutiontov] Can you give us a specific figure?

[Goncharov] One point six percent. So there are no grounds for talking about a rayon center near Moscow influencing law and order in the capital. One could equally well sound the alarm in connection with the fact, for example, that two Kamchatka inhabitants committed crimes in the capital last year, and say that Kamchatka has an influence on the crime rate in Moscow.

[Gutiontov] You give the figure of 1.6 percent. What is the situation in other rayons near Moscow?

[Goncharov] I will give you what we consider to be the most objective indicator -- the number of crimes by teenagers per 1,000 inhabitants. Lyubertsy ranks one from the bottom if we take all the rayons in Moscow Oblast. That is, one of the best rayons from our point of view. Moreover, the crime rate is falling here -- very sharply last year, in fact, and that includes particularly serious crimes. The same trend was observed in January this year.

[Gutiontov] So why is it that public opinion has singled out Lyubertsy in particular?

[Goncharv] Well, the first thing is that this city begins almost immediately beyond the Moscow beltway -- it is closer to the center of Moscow from here than from any other new housing development district. Naturally, young people in Lyubertsy have been coming to Moscow for quite some time now to spend their evenings in the cafes, discotheques, and movie theaters.... Why not? It is another matter entirely that, unfortunately, there actually have been clashes between them and young Muscovites. But not only Lyubersy residents behave erratically in public places -- in discos, for example.

[Gutiontov] But surely these Lyubertsy "gyms," these athletic training clubs, are becoming renowned now? They have a firm reputation as training halls of a kind for committing outrages on Moscow streets....

[Goncharov] There are 56 so-called "gyms" in Lyubertsy, about 500 people use them, including 200 teenagers. Forgive me, but this is a laughable, insignificant figure. Anyway, these 200 teenagers do not, as a rule, spend their evenings in Moscow discotheques -- they cannot spare the time, they are too busy "training".... Incidentally, have you yourself ever seen these young people or spoken to them?

[Gutiontov] Yes, of course.

[Goncharov] And?

[Gutiontov] Ordinary teenagers, in my opinion.

[Goncharov] Precisely. It is bad that people are now making them out to be some kind of menace. Moreover, there are plenty of examples of youngsters from other towns, Moscow included, passing themselves off as "Lyubery," like when I was young and we said "But I'm from Marinaya Roshcha!" whenever we found ourselves in a difficult situation, when there was actually no connection at all. In this particular case, this kind of "authority" very often works against young people who are absolutely straight, as you say.

[Gutiontov] So these "Lyubery" who are being so much talked about in Moscow at present -- and outside Moscow as well -- are, quite simply, unjustly accused young sportsmen?

[Goncharov] Of course not. We have been to dozens of places where young people from Lyubertsy usually meet -- cafes, discotheques -- and we have seen for ourselves that everything is in order, there are no incidents with young Muscovites. It is another matter if a place has room for only 100 people and as many as 400 have gathered in line (this does happen), and then those left on the street begin wondering what to do with themselves.... [paragraph continues]

In short, that percentage of crimes I have already mentioned has to come from somewhere, after all. But, I can assure you, groups of "genuine Muscovites" with time on their hands cause us enough problems.

[Gutiontov] It seems to me that this is beside the point, Viktor Vasilyevich. "Lyubery" are not only suspected of being unable to order their free time but also of drawing up some kind of "program" envisaging the physical repression, so to speak, of anyone not to their liking. They are averse, for example, to those who follow certain musical trends -- so they beat up anyone they meet if it takes their fancy. They also have a slogan which runs something like this: "Let's get rid of all dirt!" Basically, the word "Lyubery" no longer has geographical implications alone. "Lyubery" are people professing a cult of force who cannot tolerate anyone different from themselves.

[Goncharov] I understand what you are saying. There are no "Lyubery" in the sense you intend. Forgive me for being abrupt, but they are a fiction invented by some of your journalist colleagues. I am thinking of recent items in a respected journal and a no less respected weekly. We have painstakingly checked out every fact contained in the articles that we possibly could, requested that the authors provide us with additional information, and promised to take the strictest measures against our members if it should transpire that they have in actual fact somehow shielded hooligans.... But it has become clear that the whole story is based on rumors, conjecture, misrepresentation, and downright juggling of facts. A photograph of the "terrible Lyubery" in one of the items is worthless. It turned out that they had photographed two students, fine young men, Komsomol members, who had been persuaded that a report was being prepared in defense of the Lyubertsy sports clubs... It is on this "basis" that the really frightening "ideology" you mention has been attributed to the "Lyubery."

These items have made an impression on everyone unfamiliar with the real state of affairs and have agitated teenagers from informal groups. Willingly or no, they have been given a specific "enemy" who they can "lay their hands on" in the literal sense of the word. The logic is simple: "Let us prove that we are stronger than the 'Lyubery.'" As I have said already, they, too, are far from being good little boys....

We now have a very difficult situation as a result.

[Gutiontov] What do you mean?

[Goncharov] Well, the situation is this. We are now having to remove notices like these from Moscow schools and vocational-technical schools: "On 22 February our vocational-technical school No 13 is going to the park of culture to deal with the 'Lyubery.' We wil be joined by vocational-technical schools Nos 1, 139, 197, 82, 39, 51, 3, 11, and 37.... We will defend Moscow!...." And so on. On the basis of statements by journalists, a "heavy metal" group (people who follow a particular musical trend) even drew up a complete "appeal": "More and more innocent Muscovites are falling victim to the vandals from Lyubertsy.... They are roaming around Moscow looking as if they own the place.... We 'heavy metal' followers in Moscow are declaring a relentless war on the 'Lyubery' throughout the city and the oblast.... The press has already correctly summed up the Lyubery' — now it is up to us!!!!"

You see how easy it is to make a real blunder, as they say, in a situation like this. I will be frank, we had great difficulty on 22 February in preventing clashes between groups of youngsters. [paragraph continues]

What is more, they really believed that the honor of their native city was under threat and that they really were nipping in the bud an evil that was being "tolerated by the militia."

[Gutiontov] What is being done now is this respect?

[Goncharov] A program is being prepared under the leadership of the Moscow party gorkom and obkom to organize work with informal youth associations, the main role naturally being played by the Komsomol.... A joint friendship evening was held last week for young people from Lyubertsy and Moscow's Volgogradskiy rayon. Our comrades present at the evening said that it went very well. A city athletics club has been formed in Lyubertsy; it is headed by A. Vorobyev, a person who has great authority in the city and is rector of a physical culture institute and an honored master of sport.... Explanatory work has been stepped up in schools, technical colleges, and vocational-technical schools.... But, I will be honest, it is extremely difficult to combat the rumors and prejudices which now have gained a firm hold.

[Gutiontov] So how are you doing this?

[Goncharov] I recently met with the leaders of some of Moscow's informal groups -- these "heavy metal" people and hippies. I listened to their claims against the "Lyubery." Fine, I said, but do you have any facts? Tell me what they are and I will make a note of them. And again -- no facts....

[Gutiontov] But the assumption has been made that young people simply do not trust the militia....

[Goncharov] At this particular meeting I suggested that they telephone specific militia divisions on whose territory these "undesirable contacts" are most likely to occur. I told them that the chiefs in all these divisions will have received the appropriate instructions, which is actually so.

[Gutiontov] And?

[Goncharov] Well, this was the arrangement I made with these young people.

[Gutiontov] Did they phone?

[Goncharov] Two weeks went by and there was not a single call....

RESOLUTION ISSUED ON STATE ARBITRATION ORGANS

LD271620 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 27 Feb 87

[Text] The CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers have adopted a resolution on further refining the activities of the organs of state arbitration and enhancing their role in strengthening legality and contractual discipline in the national economy. It notes that implementation of the socioeconomic tasks posed by the 27th CPSU Congress, the active introduction and efficient use of new economic management methods and expanding independence and increasing responsibility, socialist enterprise and initiative in enterprises and organizations require that the law on economic relations be strengthened. Under these conditions, the importance of economic contracts and their unconditional fulfillment is growing increasingly.

State arbitrators, prosecutors, the ministries of internal affairs, the ministries of justice, the Supreme Court and the people's control committees of the USSR have been instructed to improve coordination and increase the efficiency of joint work to prevent, halt, and eliminate by lawful means only infringements of plan and contractual discipline. The resolution will be published in the press.

BENEFITS OF MINISTRY PRESS CENTERS DISPUTED

PM061435 [Editorial Report] Moscow PRAVDA in Russian in its Second Edition for 27 February 1987 publishes on page 3 under the headline "Conveyor Belts of Ostentation" a 1,900-word report by Yu. Makhrin disputing the benefits of press centers in USSR central ministries and departments. Makhrin complains that, instead of publicizing problems and deficiencies in the ministries, the press centers are used by the leadership of the ministries "to make maximum use of central and local mass information organs to give wide coverage to progressive experience and the sector's achievements" or, more simply, just to advertise new products, paint a "rosy" picture of the sector's work, and counter critical press reports. Makhrin writes: "Press center personnel complain that they are made to propagandize dubious innovations and poor-quality equipment. People pressure them, squeeze them, and make demands. 'Ideological backup' is what departments cynically call the publication of articles in the capital's press which glibly advertise unmarketable and even useless commodities." The report concludes as follows: "Now is the time for strict assessments and an impartial, truthful analysis of the state of affairs. So, I believe, it makes sense to halt at last the conveyor belts of ostentation, on servicing which a lot of public money is spent. Quite unjustified extravagance!"

NOVOSTI COMMENTATORS NOTE IMPACT OF CPSU CONGRESS

AU050830 [Editorial Report] Bratislava PRAVDA in Slovak on 3 March publishes on page 6 interviews given by NOVOSTI commentators Vladimir Nytarev, Spartak Beglov, and Colonel Vasiliy Morozov to Rudolf Nittmann, head of the Bratislava PRAVDA foreign policy department. The interviews, the dates and places of which are not specified, deal with the implementation of the CPSU policy line in the year that has elapsed since the 27th CPSU Congress. The 2,600-word interview with Vladimir Mytarev is entitled "Restructuring — An Irreversible Process" and deals with internal developments in the USSR in the last 12 months. Asked about the changes that have occurred in the Soviet Union since the 27th party congress, Mytarev says that changes can be observed in all walks of life. He points to the proposals to make the election system more democratic, to the new law permitting "individual" economic activity, to new legislation on production cooperatives and the direct involvement of enterprises and ministries on foreign markets, and to the draft bill on the state enterprise that provides for the election of the enterprise management. He also refers to the "stormy" congresses of writers, film-makers, and dramatic artists that took place in the course of the year and to the "new vocabulary" used in the economy: "Concepts and terms condemned only a few years ago, such as profit, loss, and market boom, have come into standard use. Fruitless theoretical arguments about the possibility of commodity-market relations under socialism have given way to businesslike discussions about the gist of economic accountability [chozrascot] and 'rebellious' statements about closures of loss-making enterprises." The "sobriety campaign" has also yielded the first results, according to Mytarev, with a steep decline in traffic accidents and coronary-vascular diseases. A major change has occurred also in the attitudes of deputies and party functionaries, who "are openly and candidly turning to the people with amassed problems and with analyses of the goings-on in the country." This contrasts with the former "smugness" of many senior officials who "dodged the solution of burning problems," thereby increasing their number and bringing about "phenomena of stagnation."

In his next reply, Mytarev explains the need for a "radical reform" of the Soviet economy. He refers to the declining growth rates of the Soviet economy, chronic manpower shortages, poor quality, and "imperfect" relations among individual sectors, all problems which the former economic mechanism proved to be unable to tackle. However, despite some positive results achieved in 1986 (such as the "unexpected 4.1 percent increase in the national income"), Mytarev cautions that restructuring in the economy has only just begun and that it is too early to judge the effect of some of the adopted measures. Mytarev then explains some of the principles of the economic reform, such as transition to self-financing or the right (granted to about 70 enterprises) to operate directly on foreign markets.

The NOVOSTI commentator goes on to discuss the emphasis placed on social issues in the process of acceleration. He says that the development of the social sphere has been neglected in recent years, which accounted for the "emergence of elements of social injustice" and called forth "negative processes in the awareness of the Soviet people." The 12th 5-Year Plan seeks to "set these mistakes right," Mytarev says, and reviews the salary increases planned for coming years (for physicians, teachers, and academics, for example) and plans with respect to increasing the production of consumer goods, expanding services, and providing each family with an apartment of its own within 15 years.

Mytarev moves on to discuss the implementation of congress resolutions in media and cadre policy. He points out that the broadest sections of the population have become involved in the solution of all social problems, that "openness" [co najsirsia informovanost] has become a feature of everyday life, and that "there are no taboo topics in the press and no 'zones' upon which criticism must not touch."

Cadre issues, he goes on to say, are dealt with under "increasingly democratic conditions": "The suggestion that several candidates be proposed for consideration and that the secret ballot be used has barely appeared and one district party committee of the Kemerovo Oblast (western Siberia) has already staged elections in this way. A secretary of the city party committee in Narva (Estonia) has also been elected according to the 'new system.'" But restructuring does not concern just cadre work, Mytarev continues. Party committees do not strive to replace economic agencies, soviets, and trade unions and they have stopped concerning themselves with "petty tutelage of the Komsomol and many social oragnizations."

In his closing reply, Mytarev answers Nittmann's question whether the expansion of the cooperative sector and individual economic activity do not generate the threat of "a trend toward the revival of private ownership." Mytarev begins his answer by saying that the term "unearned income" used to be misinterpreted in the Soviet Union. It was applied to the money received by a woman selling self-knitted gloves or flowers grown in her own garden or the money paid to a man who repaired his neighbor's television set, but not to the bonuses paid for shoddy workmanship or to the pay of the workers of a factory producing unsalable merchandise. This violated the principle that earnings should be pegged to work results. It has been realized, Mytarev says, that it is better to "conclude alliance" with the "moonlighters" than to wage a struggle against them, all the more so as the state does not meet the demand for the services and goods they provide. This was the motive for the adoption of legislation on "individual work activity" and on the expansion of cooperative forms.

Mytarev denies that the new opportunities might give rise to a new class of private entrepreneurs. He argues that the cooperative and "individual" workers will earn their living with their own hands (as hired labor is forbidden) and that their social standing will be that of tradesmen, "a group that was always endemic to cities and which we 'industrialized,' apparently prematurely."

Mytarev also points out that only very few private workshops have been set up so far, because of the scarcity of premises, lack of tradition, and the unavailability of detailed tax regulations, which have yet to be worked out. That is why the talk of "astronomical earnings" of this group of people is only hypothetical, he says, adding that "anyway, their earnings will be commensurate with their labor input and that does not require any additional explanations -- as much as they do, that much they will make."

The 1,600-word interview with Spartak Beglov is entitled "Delivering the World From Wars" and deals with international developments since the 27th CPSU Congress. On the basis of the analysis made at the congress, Beglov identifies the main features of the current international situation and emphasizes the need for "new thinking" and for renunciation of the military option in the nuclear age. He also points to the need for peaceful cooperation of states in view of the "global problems" that confront mankind (such as the scarcity of energy and other resources, hunger, or environmental problems), and accuses "imperialism" of continuing to attempt to solve its own contradictions and its conflicts with the socialist and developing world by military means. To back up his contention, Beglov cites various events of the past year which he says bear out the U.S. leadership's policy of "escalating confrontation" (continuing nuclear tests, the air raid on Libya, and "stepped up overt or covert participation in the undeclared wars" in Latin America and Afghanistan). He also discusses the Soviet-American summit in Reykjavik and views the rejection of the Soviet proposals by the Reagan administration as evidence that its policy runs counter to the demands of "new thinking."

In his concluding reply, Beglov analyzes the prospects of Soviet-American relations. He says: "To a great extent, the positive development of Soviet-American relations will depend on whether Washington will follow Moscow in choosing as its point of departure the most important accomplishment of Reykjavik -- the fact that the door to an agreement on deep cuts in nuclear arsenals and on their subsequent complete liquidation is wide open. I have said already that there are influential forces in the United States that are frightened by this prospect. Nonetheless, we proceed from the belief that the summit meetings of 1985-86 represent a certain landmark in the relations between the USSR and the United States, a landmark that leaves many opportunities open to realize this prospect, even under the current U.S. Administration. After all, the arms race has not stopped. Weapons are becoming more sophisticated and their stockpiles are growing at an accelerating pace. That is why we cannot afford to lose time, not even a day, let alone 2 years. That is why the Soviet side is ready to work on the whole set of problems, to meet the other side halfway, to accept compromise solutions. The development of Soviet-American relations is called for in many areas: the economy, science and technology, culture, and so forth. There also exist other forces in the United States, forces that are influential in the spheres in which they operate and that have begun to display initiative and to promote these relations independent of the administration. The number of people is constantly growing in the United States (which also was borne out by my meetings with Americans at the recent international forum in Moscow) who have come to understand that America needs the ability to think and act in a new way just as badly as we do. This cannot fail to influence the formation of a new generation of American politicians, politicians capable of giving up the illusions of the past and of coming to terms with the realities of the present."

The 900-word interview with Vasiliy Morozov is entitled "Program To Save Mankind" and reviews the Soviet Union's disarmament initiatives since the 27th CPSU Congress. It discusses the proposal of 15 January 1986 to liquidate nuclear weapons by the year 2000, the Soviet proposals of Reykjavik (stressing that they form a "package" and that none of its elements can be excluded and set apart), and the reasons that make a ban on nuclear tests a crucial step toward nuclear disarmament.

JEWISH WOMEN BEGIN HUNGER STRIKE FOR EMIGRATION

AU081538 Paris AFP in English 1219 GMT 8 Mar 87

[Text] Moscow, March 8 (AFP) -- Seventy-five Jewish women began a three-day hunger strike in several Soviet cities on Sunday in protest at the refusal of the authorities to allow them and their families to emigrate to Israel, one of them told AGENCEFRANCE-PRESSE.

In Moscow 54 women were fasting in four city apartments until Tuesday night, while similar demonstrations were being held in Leningrad, Gorkiy, Riga, Tallinn, Kiev, Kharkov and Yerevan.

The fast coincides with International Women's Day.

2 FRENCH FAMILIES IN ARMENIA TO GET EXIT VISAS

AU081541 Paris AFP in English 1236 GMT 8 Mar 87

[Text] Moscow, March 8 (AFP) -- Two French families living in Soviet Armenia have won their long battle to leave the Soviet Union, a reliable source here said Sunday.

Jean Der-Sarkissian, 57, who has Armenian roots, is to be stripped of his Soviet citizenship and has been given less than two weeks to leave with his Parisian wife Luce and their three children, the source said.

He emigrated with his parents from Valence in southern France to Soviet Armenia in 1947, along with 4,000 other Armenians in France.

He refused to surrender his French passport, and at the end of the Stalin era in 1953 felt it was safe to apply to leave.

Last July he pleaded his case with French President Francois Mitterrand during his visit to Moscow, and French diplomats have made several appeals on his behalf.

Mr. Der-Sarkissian had to pay the equivalent of a year's wages for the paperwork to renounce his and his family's citizenship, which he never admitted he held, and he is now waiting for an official signature on a decree approved in January by the President of the Supreme Soviet.

In another such case, Aleks Chabazian and his family of four have been told they can leave the country through a judicial procedure similar to expulsion.

PAPER REBUTS RUMORS OF LEAK AT CHERNOBYL

AU060950 Kiev RADYANSKA UKRAINA in Ukrainian 28 Feb 87 p 4

[Report by A. Kraslyanskyy, RADYANSKA UKRAINA correspondent in Chernobyl: "What Is Going On in Chernobyl Today?"]

[Excerpts] Although it seemed such a short time since my last visit to Chernobyl, countless changes had taken place. [paragraph continues]

They struck the eye just beyond Kiev, at the beginning of the Chernobyl highway. Whereas a few months ago a kolkhoz truck was a rarity among the concrete mixers and military vehicles, these trucks are now in full control of the road. Beets, pipes, cattle, and other kinds of quite "civilian" freight were flowing in a wide stream.

Along the highway there were no signs, common until recently, prohibiting one to deviate from the paved lane.

Certainly, this was true before the 30-kilometer zone. However, even the zone itself looked more tranquil and confident.

In Chernobyl, this impression grew particularly strong. Perhaps it was so because there was less military equipment visible in the city streets, and there were fewer people together. Perhaps it was primarily because there was no one wearing a respirator, and there were no radiation supervisers with their instruments, who used to be posted almost at every step.

Already "respirators are superfluous, are they not?" I asked a familiar physicist I met in the house accomodating the government commission.

"They are, practically. The air is now pure, there are no aerosols, and the level of radiation has dropped significantly."

"How much?"

"Compared with the fall, at least by a factor of 3, and now it is nearing an acceptable level. Anyhow, I have been working here almost from the beginning and feel perfectly well," he smiled. [passage omitted]

In the large and bright corridor of the Chernobyl AES, I met V.O. Rybalko, deputy chief engineer. He was not wearing a respirator and, by the way, none of the passers-by were, either. Of course, my first question was how the reactor of power block No 4 was doing that day.

"It is completely quiet," Volodymyr Oleksanrovych said. "It has been reliably, hermetically covered with metal and concrete from all sides. On the roof of the sarcophagus there are filters with powerful ventilators through which air passes which is purified of aerosols. [passage omitted]

"Here and there, one frequently runs up against allegations that there have been some leaks from reactor No 4."

"This is idle talk by light-minded people who listen to marketplace gossip. There have not been and could not have been any harmful leaks into the atmosphere for a long time. Where could such leaks come from, when the reactor freely 'breathes' through the filters of the ventilation system and, therefore, no gases accumulate in it? Sometime in January, I remember, a neutron detecting element went out of order. To be on the safe side, we began to check the entire monitoring system. After all, this is what our service exists for. Some people, worried about this, spread the rumor that a discharge almost lifted the lid of the sarcophagus, but this is even physically impossible. In a word, if anyone has any doubts, let him come and have a look for himself -- the present radiation situation does not endanger him in any way. [passage omitted]

"However there still are zones at the station with increased radiation, are there not?"

"But who says the effects of the accident have been fully eliminated? We still have much to do. This year we are expected to put into operation power block No 3. The radiation safety service has concentrated in that area all forces to fully clear the premises so that assembly workers, builders, and other specialists can operate safely. No one now is going to send people to places even slightly dangerous for their health. We have cleared the remains of the radioactive explosion from the roof of power block No 3, but individual particles were so hot that they literally penetrated the bitumen cover. Therefore, the roof of that power block will have to be changed completely. The site is now being cleared for the construction of blocks Nos 5 and 6. Last but not least, the decontamination of the 30-kilometer zone will have to be completed. All these are problems which have to be settled by the personnel along with military and other specialists."

"Judging from everything, the situation in the 30-kilometer zone is rapidly improving, too."

"Each time I drive after work through localities from which people had been evacuated, I switch on my dosimetric devices. In most cases, the level of radiation has dropped to normal. However, there still is much to do to decontaminate the city of Pripyat and to log the so-called red forest."

"Does it still create an increased radiation background?"

"It does, and will do so until it is logged and burned in special furnaces, and the soil is buried. [passage omitted]

We mentioned the flood that may begin in the spring and may carry radioactive particles into the water basin. Volodymyr Oleksandrovych said:

"I am confident that there will be no contamination whatsoever. The protective dams, the ditches, and the filtering system will protect the Pripyat and the Dnepr from radioactive water, even if there is a flood. However, there will be no flood because scientists and we, ourselves, have developed and are putting into effect the "Flood" program, encompassing measures to bring a flood under control. Indeed, we are capable of controlling a flood. On the one hand, nature itself helps us. Almost all through February, there were thick fogs which have 'eaten up' the snow that covered sites showing increased radiation. On the other hand, we have been coloring the snow cover and taking other steps to hasten the thaw."

The rhythm in which the Chernobyl AES lives is normal. Shifts replace one another. At the same time, all equipment and monitoring instruments themselves are under vigilant control. [passage omitted]

CPSU CONTROL BODY CENSURES KAZAKH ACADEMY OFFICIALS

PM181451 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Feb 87 First Edition p 3

[Unattributed report: "At the CPSU Central Committee Party Control Committee"]

[Text] On Serious Shortcomings in the Work of Individual Communist Leaders of the Kazakh SSR Academy of Sciences in Increasing the Effectiveness and Accelerating the Introduction of the Results of Scientific Research Into Production in the Light of the 27th CPSU Congress' Requirements [subhead]

An investigation carried out by the CPSU Central Committee Party Control Committee has exposed serious shortcomings in the activity of the presidium, institutes, and other establishments of the Kazakh SSR Academy of Sciences in increasing the effectiveness of scientific research and accelerating the introduction of its results into the national economy. The committee discussed the results of the investigation and adopted a decision on this question.

The decision notes the proportion and the standards of fundamental research in institutes of the republic's academy have fallen noticeably in recent years, the amount of original development work has declined, not a single scientific discovery has been made, and not a single license has been sold.

Approximately 45 percent of the solutions submitted were not accepted as inventions because they were neither innovative nor useful. Not one of the academy's institutions has joined the scientific and technical complexes created in the country. The resources allocated to the metallurgy and enrichment, nuclear physics, experimental biology, soil science, and a number of other institutes for carrying out scientific research work have not produced the proper return.

To a considerable extent this situation resulted from the poor standard of leadership of the academy's activity by Comrade A.M. Kunayev, its former president and a CPSU member. While holding this responsible post for 12 years he crudely flouted the principles of collective leadership, made decisions on his own on questions requiring collective discussion, and ignored critical observations and advice from USSR Academy of Sciences specialists and experts on the reuslts of investigations into the activity of academic institutions in the republic.

Comrade Kunayev's personal conduct was also improper. He drank alcohol excessively, he was often absent from the academy, failed to make important speeches [sryval otvetstvennyye vystupleniya], and did not perform educational work within the collective in the manner befitting a communist leader.

In this situation presidium members were deprived of the opportunity of active participation in the resolution of the important questions of the academy's life and work. The role of the departmental bureaus and general meetings, scientific problem-solving councils, and institute scientific councils was undermined.

Negative phenomena such as favoritism, nepotism, and local preference [zemlyachestvo] developed in cadre policy. Sometimes workers were appointed to leading posts who were poorly trained for their profession, were morally lax, and abused their official position. The principles of continuity in the leadership of scientific institutions was violated and the recruitment of new scientific staff was not ensured. The proportion of scientists and leaders of pensionable age in the academy is high. Young scientists constitute only 5 percent of candidates of science. The postgraduate scientific cadre training system is inefficient. In the 11th 5-Year Plan only 50 out of 680 students submitted their dissertations on time. The great shortage of highly skilled specialists in a number of the most important scientific spheres is having its effect, as is the lack of a reserve of leaders at all levels. The correct representation of scientists of different nationalities within the academy is not being ensured.

Many ostentatious mass events have been organized at the academy and on a number of occasions considerable amounts of state money were unlawfully spent on them and also on organizing related events such as receptions, banquets, and the presentation of gifts to guests and participants.

These and other shortcomings had an adverse effect on the general level of scientific research and the moral and psychological atmosphere, which was characterized by a lack of control, irresponsibility, obsequiousness, mutual flattery, and total license.

The academy's leaders, above all Comrade Kunayev, took no care to secure the Academy of Sciences' role as the coordinator of scientific research work in the republic. Consequently it failed to exert effective influence on the acceleration of scientific and technical progress and the development of production forces in Kazakhstan.

The republic's scientists failed to develop fundamentally new areas in the technology of opening up and exploiting ore and coal deposits and other natural raw materials. The necessary attention has not been paid to research into rational land use and feed production systems. Research on economic and social problems is underdeveloped. The development of research in the sphere of mining machine building, nuclear physics, solid-state physics, and electronics is unsatisfactory.

The academy leadership's work on questions of the planning and organization of scientific research is unsatisfactory. This has led to numerous instances of the duplication of scientific topics and the performance of research which falls outside the sphere of institutes' activity.

The necessary measures have not been taken to establish well-equipped design bureaus or joint installations for verifying laboratory research or to equip institutes with modern instruments, computers, and scientific research automation facilities. Virtually no use has been made of the experimental production base which has been created. There is a large amount of valuable equipment left unused in the academy's subsections.

Exploiting the atmosphere of indifference and low demands, the leaders of some institutes resorted to distortion of figures and exaggeration of the effectiveness of scientific reseach work. Comrade S.M. Kozhakhmetov, vice president of the academy and a CPSU member, who is responsbile for the introduction of scientific development work, did not ensure the appropriate monitoring of the progress of work and tolerated instances of deception and misrepresentation. He did not take effective measures to ensure the full use of the resources allocated for capital construction or the rational use of equipment.

The academy also resolved social questions unsatisfactorily. Around 1,000 staffers are in need of better housing and more than 200 young scientists' families are waiting in line for hostel places. Catering for academy staffers and medical and consumer services for scientists are poorly organized and there are insufficient places for their children at kindergartens and young pioneers' camps.

The party organizations of the presidium apparatus and of a number of the academy's scientific institutions have worked without intiative, made poor use of the right granted by the CPSU Statutes to monitor the activity of the administration, and did not exert significant influence on the improvement of work with scientific cadres or on increasing the effectiveness of research. Openness, criticism, and self-criticism in the life of party organizations were belittled. Deviations from the norms of party life and morality and breaches of staff and financial discipline and of the laws on joint office-holding and material and moral incentives were ignored.

The Academy of Sciences Presidium (where Comrade M.A. Aytkhozhin is president) is slow to restructure its activity in the light of the demands of the Central Committee April (1985) Plenum and 27th CPSU Congress. The measures being taken to focus scientific manpower and material resources on resolving the most important scientific and technical problems, accelerating the pace of scientific research, and increasing the efficiency of work of every sceintific collective are not persistent enough. Nor is the necessary persistence being shown in overcoming the negative phenomena in the academic world, particlarly in work with scientific cadres. Work to improve the academy's structure and scientific workers' pay has not been completed.

For a long time the Kazakh Communist Party Central Committee and the Kazakh SSR Council of Ministers allowed the Academy of Sciences and many of its scientific institutions to go uncriticized, not monitoring the fulfillment of their own decisions on questions of the academy's work and taking no steps to eliminate shortcomings in its activity.

For grave shortcomings in the organization of the work of the academy presidium and its apparatus and for gross violations of party principles in work with cadres and incorrect personal conduct during his term as president of the Kazakh SSR Academy of Sciences, the CPSU Central Committee Party Control Committee has severely reprimanded Comrade M.A. Kunayev, member of the CPSU, and endorsed his record card.

The same verdict was passed on Comrade S.M. Kozhakhmetov, vice president of the Kazakh SSR Academy of Sciences and member of the CPSU, for failing to monitor the introduction of scientific developments and for failing to take measures to eliminate distortions and misrepresentations when determining their economic efficiency and shortcomings in the work of taking up capital investments.

Note was taken of the statements by Comrade Z. Kamalidenov, secretary of the Kazakh Communist Party Central Committee; Comrade V.A. Grebenyuk, first deputy chairman of the Kazakh SSR Council of Ministers; and Comrade M.A. Aytkhozhin, president of the Kazakh SSR Academy of Sciences, that in accordance with the 27th CPSU Congress decisions the republic Communist Party Central Committee and the Kazakh SSR Council of Ministers and Academy of Sciences Presidium will take the necessary measures to fundamentally improve the organization of scientific research work and the use of their results in the national economy and will draw the necessary conclusions from the discussion or this question at the CPSU Central Committee Party Control Committee.

The CPSU Central Committee Party Control Committee took note of the statement by Academician G.K. Skryabin, chief scientific secretary of the USSR Academy of Sciences Presidium, that the USSR Academy of Sciences will give the Kazakh SSR Academy of Sciences help in eliminating the shortcomings and in restructuring its activity in the light of the 27th CPSU Congress demands.

PRAVDA VIEWS 'OWNERSHIP' IN ECONOMIC REFORM

PM051425 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Feb 87 Second Edition pp 2-3

[Doctor of Economic Scienes V. Kulikov article under the rubric "Questions of Theory": "Socialist Ownership in the Concept of Acceleration"]

[Text] "Communists," K. Marx and F. Engels wrote in the "Communist Party Manifesto," "can express their theory in one thesis: the destruction of private ownership" (Works, Vol 4, p 438). This is a concise yet capacious formula expressing the essence of the replacement of capitalism by socialism.

The chief advantages and achievements of our formation are connected precisely with social ownership of the means of production. This does not mean, however, that they emerge and are realized automatically. The slowdown (from both the quantitative and the qualitative aspects) in economic growth which clearly came to light in the early eighties is graphic evidence of this. The forms of economic management lost their flexibility, and full use was not made of the potential for increasing the gross product and services.

We are now rectifying the situation. Not only theoreticians but also practical workers have brought to the fore questions of increasing socialist ownership and of its structure and forms of implementation. It is on these problems, which are actively being discussed, that the author expresses his viewpoint.

1.

Ownership is a complex, multilayered phenomenon embracing the system of relations among people, collectives, sectors, and regions of the country with regard to utilizing the means and results of production and the whole range of economic interests. The object of ownership is represented, above all, by material-substantial elements of the national wealth. Bearing this aspect of the matter in mind, K. Marx wrote that "private ownership is nothing but /embodied/ [slantlines denote boldface as published] labor" (Vol 42, p 242).

Increasing ownership means building up the quantitative and qualitative parameters of its object. Outside this there is and can be no development in relations of socialist ownership.

By the year 2000, as is known, it is proposed to double our country's economic potential and fund of prosperity. Whereas the average annual rates of increase in national income, labor productivity, and the population's real income stood at 3.1, 3, and 2.2 percent in the 11th 5-Year Plan, over the next 15 years it is planned to reach levels of 5, 6, and 4 percent respectively. This is, of course, a strenuous target, which will not be easy to fulfill. But it is minimal in the sense that the accelerated resolution of urgent socioeconomic problems is impossible without achieving such rates.

The opinion is sometimes expressed that high rates of economic growth are incompatible with improving product quality. That conviction appears to be corroborated by years of practice: Increased rates were frequently maintained at the cost of a worsening of product quality (a number of technological operations were eliminated, less care was taken in the processing of raw materials, and so forth). This principle was elevated to the rank of an almost unshakable postulate: "Let us first put an end to shortages, and then let us tackle quality."

But it is impossible to increase the rate of economic growth to such an extent as to eliminate shortages without intensifying production. And this is inconceivable without a sharp improvement in the quality of both industrial and consumer products. Thus, if machine builders increase production volumes for products which meet world standards by less than 30 percent, will this make it possible to carry out the national economy's profound technical modernization and the economy's all-around intensification and to increase its efficiency? The answer to this question is obvious. It must not be forgotten that in the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress and the Central Committee June (1986) Plenum the 43-percent growth of machine-building output in the current 5-year plan entails production by 1990 of 80-95 percent of its main types to a standard at least equal to world standards, while the doubling of fixed production capital by the year 2000 also presupposes its full updating on the basis of the achievements of scientific and technical progress.

The same can also be said of consumer goods and services: Production volumes must be increased only if there is a substantial improvement in quality. Quality is the most objective and generalizing indicator of scientific and technical progress, of the level of production organization, and of labor standards and discipline.

Of course, we cannot rule out situations where an improvement in output quality at a particular enterprise might prove incompatible not only with an increase in production volumes but even with the maintenance of previous volumes. In these cases it is evidently possible to waive quantity in the interests of quality. With regard to the economy as a whole the connection between quantity and quality is becoming fundamentally different: not from quantity to new quality but through the achievement of new quality to a cardinal increase in economic growth rates. An objective basis is thereby created for the organic combination of opposite principles -- quality and quantity.

However, people still frequently discuss quantity in isolation from quality and even in counterbalance to it. These arguments are also encountered: Since, it is said, qualitative characteristics are being advanced to the fore, it is not worth placing special emphasis on economic growth rates.

The task is a dual one, however: quantity not in counterbalance but in alliance with and on the basis of quality -- this is the command of the times. This is the indispensable condition for imparting a qualitatively new state to the object of socialist ownership.

2.

Not only the object of ownership but also its structure changes in the course of development. Here it is important to elucidate what happens to it: Is it simplified or does it, on the contrary, perhaps, become more complex and multifaceted? The answer predetermines the notions about the legitimate forms of econmic management for a socialist society.

For a long time theory and practice (although this was not always clearly realized) proceeded from the postulate that the structure both of ownership and of the forms of economic management is quite simple under socialism (the state and cooperative forms of ownership and management, as well as private ownership, with which the private subsidiary plot and housework were connected in one way or another). Here it was considered that this structure is in many ways static and that, if it does change, it becomes simpler.

In accordance with this, attempts were made to artificially accelerate rapprochement between cooperative and state ownership and to eliminate the private subsidiary plot. Projects were drawn up to curtail housework, backed up by real steps, in particular, to involve women in social production over and above the permitted scale, to increasingly remove housing from private ownership, and so forth.

Social and private ownership were becoming increasingly sharply delineated in terms of areas. Private ownership assumed a clearly expressed consumer nature, and its link with production became well-defined and unidirectional -- through placing part of the created product at private disposal. Relations among enterprises boiled down to a commodity exchange over a predetermined range of products and to competition in terms of the results of production activity.

But real economic life did not fit within that theoretical scheme and made "breaches" in it. Mixed (interkolkhoz and state-kolkhoz) projects emerged. To solve social questions some of the enterprises' means were united in various forms. Ownership of social organizations was asserted, the cooperative form of housing construction became widespread, and some forms of "secondary employment" (student and nonstudent construction detachments and so forth) emerged.

However, there were also forms of economic life, particularly in the area of supplies and services for the population, which were so far removed from the scheme that they were banned. If some of the "illegal" kinds of economic activity nonetheless existed, they assumed distorted forms with rigid inevitability. More harm than good was done as a result. It is right here, in my view, that the main roots of the so-called "second" or "shadow" economy lie. It is a question not only of individual kinds of economic activity but also of relations between enterprises and establishments (covert rendering of services to each other, exchanges of scarce goods outside the plan, and so forth).

The policy of accelerating economic growth proceeds from the need to mobilize all possibilities and reserves and to utilize all forms of economic activity for which there are objective grounds and which are not in conflict with the social nature of the socialist system. This line inevitably leads to complication of the structure of ownership relations and of forms of economic life.

In this context approval is merited by the provisions of the draft USSR Law on the Enterprise, which grant it the rights to use the means at its disposal to create joint projects of both a nonproduction and a production nature; to conduct not only basic but also other kinds of economic activity (for example, to create industrial subdivisions on sovkhozes and kolkhozes, if the conditions for this exist). I believe it is right that not only the sale but also the leasing out of surplus means of production and the giving up of a part of incentive funds to subcontractor enterprises which have helped to achieve an additional effect will be legalized. When socialist enterprises are transferred to full financial autonomy, the question of commercial credit must not, in my view, be considered closed too.

Various forms that strengthen direct and inverse ties between public and private ownership can play a substantial role in strengthening the feeling of being the master and the working people's initiative. Their possible range is very varied. I will name, for example, the use of personal savings on cooperative principles to solve social questions (not only housing but also questions such as providing the population with telephone communications, children's establishments, and sports installations). [paragraph continues]

There is also the introduction of the family contract, the use of private transport on a contract basis in the activities of certain organizations and establishments, and the development of forms of "secondary" employment.

Finally, it is a question of galvanizing various forms of individual labor activity.

3.

I belive that it must not be forgotten that the level of production forces and of the socialization of production is different in different sectors of the national economy. There are still considerable and persistent discrepancies in the technical standards of enterprises, sectors, and regions, substantial differences in pay and working conditions, and relatively fixed assignment of workers to certain kinds of labor. Not in vain do people sometimes recall the technological "multistacking" of the modern economy. By failing to take this sufficiently into account, we are nurturing two opposite but very real trends: one the one hand, running ahead with the introduction of higher socialized forms of management and, on the other, lagging behind with urgent transformations.

Unoriginality and leveling deprive forms and methods of management of flexibility and leave production relations out of touch with the level reached and the production forces' potential. And the result is always the same -- a slowing up of economic growth.

In my view, it is important to further distinguish the basic (material) forms of social ownership (state and cooperative forms of ownership of the means of production) and derivative, secondary forms that emerge based on them.

The latter either emerge within the framework of the social form of ownership (including ownership by the whole people), expressing the enrichment of the forms of its movement, or serve as its distinctive continuation (integration with individual kinds of labor activity). "Of course," it was pointed out at the 27th CPSU Congress, "such kinds of labor must be fully matched with the principles of socialist management and be based either on cooperative principles or on a contract basis with socialist enterprises."

It is precisely the integration of individuals with socialized types of activity that makes them the continuation of the latter, and its forms -- as the experience of a number of socialist countries shows -- can be very diverse.

In distinguishing the chief and subsidiary directions of economic development, it evidently is not worth setting them off against each other. It is more correct complement each other. It would be naive, to say the least, to think (although such claims are encountered) that the galvanization of individual kinds of labor activity is a panacea for almost all ills in the economy. The general line remains immutable -- the improvement of socialized forms of management, from which nothing can release us.

4.

The growing complexity of the structure of ownership relations and of forms of economic activity is increasing the diversity of elements of the structure of economic interests and of motivations to work. Socialism does not remove this diversity; rather, it needs it.

Ownership of the means of production by the whole people ensures the universality of labor and guarantees the strength of the social standing of working people and their collectives. With time, however, these guarantees have come to be regarded in isolation from economic relations. Sometimes it has happened that someone has only to be registered at work in order to receive wages. However, the socialist society is by nature a working society and, in ensuring the universality of labor, it extends its guarantees only to those who work conscientiously. A departure from this principle has created favorable soil for parasitic sentiments, for laxity in work, and for obtaining essential unearned, albeit legitimate, incomes.

Leveling in distribution has never formally been proclaimed as socialism's ideal. What is more, it has constantly been criticized. In fact, social justice came to be identified with it increasingly frequently -- which created a favorable atmosphere for the spread of leveling.

However, social justice does not in itself rule out differentiation -- not even a profound differentiation -- in incomes: Everything depends on the actual differences in the real contribution to the overall work results. A departure from this principle hits hardest at those workers who are capable of giving society more than others. They frequently do not do so, because they are sure that all the same their income will not be proportional to their labor contribution. And the same applies to labor collectives.

A simultaneous wage raise for entire sections of working people has become the norm in economic management practice. The elementary truth that every such raise must be backed up by an increased labor contribution has begun to be removed from our consciousness. The former's rigid dependence on the latter is a command of the times, and without it the strengthening of a conscientious attitude to work, every worker's active involvement in production management, and enhanced production efficiency are impossible.

The 27th CPSU Congress, as is known, noted the need for creative use of Lenin's idea of a food tax, taking modern conditions into account. What bearing, you might think, can a form engendered by the socialist state's ties with individual peasant farms have on our socialist production? However, it essentially embodies an approach that is extremely important to socialist management -- the centralized share of the created product cannot be arbitrary but has its objective limits.

The same thing can also be expressed another way: Every level of management (whether it is a question of the work place or of local labor collectives, of regions, sectors, or the national economy as a whole) has its own share in the product, predetermined by the contribution of each of these levels to the overall work results. Fixing this share makes it possible to coordinate opposite interests, ensure their mutual realization, and introduce a guaranteed aspect to increasing or reducing each person's income, dependent on a change in the magnitude of the end result. It is in just this context, I believe, that we should examine the assimilation of economic methods of leadership in all links of the national economy, the broad use of economic normatives, and the transfer of enterprises to full financial autonomy.

Scientific and technical progress and all-around production intensification are not "engaged" of their own accord but by someone in a definite social relationship. This relationship channels his activity in a particular direction and galvanizes it to a greater or lesser degree. The dialectics of production forces and production relations include as an inalienable and important constituent the inverse active impact of production relations on production forces, whose significance is growing under the conditions of socialism. The improvement of relations of socialist ownership, as was pointed out at the CPSU Central Committee January (1987) Plenum, is both an indispensable condition and a decisive component of the acceleration of the development of Soviet society.

NUCLEAR-POWERED ICEBREAKER UNDER CONSTRUCTION

PM061421 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 28 Feb 87 Second Edition p 3

[I. Belyayeva report: "For Northern Latitudes. Nuclear-powered Ship 'Oktyabrskaya Revolyutsiya' on the Stocks"]

[Text] It is only approximately 3 decades since the nuclear-powered ship Lenin, the first in the Soviet icebreaker fleet, was launched. But today sailors call it "grandfather." Far more sophisticated confreres of the first icebreaker are now working in northern latitudes. Built by Baltic shipbuilders, they have helped to realize the Arctic working people's age-old dream of year-round shipping.

And the family of nuclear icebreakers is continuing to grow. The fifth nuclear-powered ship of the new series is now under construction at the Sergo Ordzhonikidze Baltic Shipyard. Its hull does not yet have a clear outline, but the giant ship's name is already known -- Oktyabrskaya Revolyutsiya.

Together with O. Pashnin, deputy leader of the Murmansk Maritime Shipping Company's Technical Supervision Group, we went up onto the stocks. Strenuous work was in full swing in the "icebreaker cradle." Oleg Georgiyevich said:

"The 'Oktyabrskaya Revolyutsiya' will embody new achievements of scientific and technical progress. Its operation will be simplified and still more reliable, and the crew's living conditions will be better. The last point is particularly important, for the Arctic makes very rigorous demands on sailors."

Pashnin knows about this at first hand. At one time he was chief mechanic on the icebreaker Lenin. It is not by chance that he has been entrusted with responsible work -- technical supervision of the building of the Oktyabrskaya Revolyutsiya.

The shipwrights' team headed by plant veteran V. Petukhov recently finished installing the next stern section of the future giant icebreaker. The shipbuilders will soon have to install two more sections in the area of the central compartment. A welders' team led by experienced shipbuilder V. Yablokov is working side by side with the hull builders. Both labor collectives have pledged to fulfill the plan for the first 2 years of the 5-year plan by the 70th anniversary of Great October.

LATE FEBRUARY WEATHER, CROP SITUATION REVIEWED

PM081339 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 5 Mar 87 p 3

[Agrometeorologist T. Ivashneva report: "Weather and Crops"]

[Text] There was a drop in temperature everywhere on the USSR's European territory in the second half of the last 10-day period of February and at the beginning of March. The minimum nighttime air temperature fell to minus 26-35 degrees; in the Baltic republics, Belorussia, northern and eastern oblasts of the Ukraine, the south of the Central Region, the Central Chernozem Region, Rostov Oblast, and the greater part of the Volga Region to minus 16-25 degrees; and over the remainder of the USSR's European territory to minus 7-14 degrees. In Krasnodar Kray a snow cover 3-9 cm deep formed, which protected winter grain crops and grasses against the effect of low temperatures.

After a thaw in the Transcaucasian republics, there wa a sharp drop in temperature. The minimum air temperature fell to minus 1-5 degrees, and to minus 8-12 degrees in mountainous regions. The frosts recorded in the Transcaucasus, the Crimea, and Krasnodar Kray could have damaged opened buds and flowers on fruit trees.

In the farming regions of West Siberia and North Kazakhstan the average air temperature was 6-11 degrees above the perennial average. Thaws were observed almost everywhere. In East Siberia, too, the weather was milder than usual. Winter grain crops and perennial grasses in Siberia and North Kazakhstan are in a dormant state.

It was warm in the Central Asian republics. The average air temperature during the 10-day period was 2-7 degrees above the perennial average. During the day the air warmed up to 17-27 degrees. Buds continued to swell and open on fruit trees. In the south of Turkmenia and Tajikistan apricot, almond, plum, cherry, and apple trees blossomed.

MEDIA COVERS 5-7 MARCH AGRICULTURAL WORK

LD090204 [Editorial report] The following is a compilation of reports on agricultural developments in the USSR carried by Moscow Domestic Service in Russian, unless otherwise indicated, from 5 to 7 March. GMT times of broadcasts are given in parentheses at the end of each item.

5 March

Surkhan-Darya is the first complex in Uzbekistan to begin harvesting cash crops: the crops sown here for fodder on an area of about 8,000 hectares are rape seed, perko, and other fodder crops; the area freed will now be sown with maize, sorghum, and other fodder crops. (1200)

The grain farmers of Belorussia are finishing preparation for spring sowing. In the South, where sowing will begin earlier, all the sowing machinery has been overhauled. In the majority of state and collective farms, only first class seeds will be used. (2050)

6 March

The agricultural workers of collective and state farms of Amur Oblast are preparing for sowing work. Almost all soil-working and sowing equipment has been overhauled. For the first time in many years, autumn plowed land was prepared to the full extent for early grain crops. (0100)

7 March

Chimkent Oblast grain growers are carrying out mass sowing of eared crops. More than a third of the area allocated to grain is now being given over to new, highly-productive varieties, among which are the wheats intensivnaya, Odesskaya-66 and the barley zavet and tsiklon, which produce more than 40 quintals per hectare on nonirrigated land. Meanwhile, work continues on tracts of land given over to winter crops, which by and large have been saved thanks to fertilizing work, although some rayon agro-industrial associations have experienced losses. Additional sowing is under way where fields have been thinned. (0100)

The mechanized workers of Uzbekistan have commenced the mass sowing of spring crops. Lucerne seeds have taken up more than 2,500 hecatres by this morning in Andizhan Oblast. (0500)

UKRAINE TAKES STEPS TO INCREASE GRAIN YIELDS

AU050949 Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian 28 Feb 87 p 3

[Unattributed report: "In the Ukrainian Council of Ministers: Eliminating Shortcomings in Preparations for Spring Sowing"]

[Text] The Ukrainian Council of Ministers Presidium has examined the progress made by Dnepropetrovsk Oblast kolkhozes and sovkhozes in preparations for the 1987 spring field work and in ensuring an increase in grain output in line with the decisions of the CPSU Central Committee and of the December 1986 plenum of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee.

It has been noted that the oblispolkom, the oblast's agro-industiral committee, as well as many rayispolkoms and rayon agro-industrial associations were inadmissibly slow in preparing for the spring sowing. Notwithstanding the increased volume of the spring field operations, a number of kolkhozes and sovkhozes still have not been fully provided with seeds, and the condition of the seeds does not always meet the requirements. Slow progress has been made in the repair of equipment, in particular of machines for intensive grain growing, and arrears have been incurred in preparing irrigation systems.

In recent years, the level of agronomic and engineering services has significantly declined at most farms, and the influence of these services on production has decreased. Many specialists have dropped behind the demands of the times, are unable to look ahead and to make decisions which are suitable for actual farming and weather conditions. They continue to work in the old way, and have not turned into authentic organizers and technologists, into the bearers of scientific achievements and advanced experience, of new methods in labor organizations, of switching kolkhozes and sovkhozes over to full economic accountability and self-financing.

Many rayons in the oblast fall short of the plans for raising the soil fertility, for the construction of manure pits and storehouses for mineral fertilizers, and for land recultivation. The application of organic fertilizers has declined in an unjustified way; there are losses and spoilage in storing fertilizers; and fertilizers are frequently applied without agrochemical recommendations and cartograms.

The fluctuation of cadres in the oblast's plant growing is still high. Workers and specialists for kolkhozes and sovkhozes are being trained and retrained in a very unsatisfactory way. In particularly, machine operators are not familiar enough with the peculiarities of intensive grain growing. Serious shortcomings have been incurred in the application of the continuous cyclic [potochno-tsiklovyy] method of labor organization in crop growing, of collective and family contracting, and in the organization of economic-accountability detachments, teams, and links. In this important work, there is a great deal of formalism: the aforesaid units have not been informed about their production tasks; and agreements have not been concluded.

The Ukrainian Council of Ministers Presidium has obligated Comrade Yu.P. Babich, Dnepropetrovsk Oblispolkom chairman, and Comrade A.I. Sytnik, oblast agro-industrial committee chairman, to take immediate steps to eliminate the serious shortcomings in preparations for the spring field work, and to raise the level of control over the agro-industrial complex in order to radically improve the situation in grain growing in line with the decision of the CPSU Central Committee and the December 1986 plenum of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee.

The instructions have also been given to hasten restructuring in all sectors, to raise the responsibility of mutual exactingness, high discipline and good organization.

Efforts have to be made everywhere to retrain cadres, to check into their skills, and to see to it that they are perfectly able to carry out the spring field work and to obtain in this way high yields.

TASS DETAILS EXPERIMENTS ON MIR SPACE STATION

LD062106 Moscow TASS in English 1846 GMT 6 Mar 87

[Text] Moscow March 6 TASS -- TASS correspondent Valentin Ovcharov reports:

The successful docking of the unmanned freighter Progress-28 to the orbiting station Mir (peace) yesterday was for Soviet cosmonauts Yuriy Romanenko and Aleksandr Laveikin the finale of their first month in space. The transporter brought more than two tons of equipment, food and fuel as well as letters from relatives, newspapers and magazines for the crew who are called by their call sign "Taimyr's" by ground control.

Romanenko and Georgiy Grechko became the first cosmonauts to receive their supplies through a Progress vehicle just ten years ago, but today it is difficult to imagine any long and busy missions aloft without the support of this kind of space trucks.

Asked about the results of Romanenko's and Laveikin's first month aboard Mir, Deputy Flight Director Viktor Blagov made this comment:

"The crew all but completed a program for installing extra equipment in this station, which had been started by Leonid Kizim and Vladimir Solovyov. This turned out quite a job as the 26th and the 27th Progress craft had taken up almost four tons of freight.

"So the spacemen had to take a careful look at what had accumulated in the station and dispose of some of the things, by putting them in Progress-27 before jettisoning it.

"The Taimyr's were also able to do some scientific studies. Among other things, they made observations and took photos of the earth's surface, using a Sevor (north) camera. It makes it possible to take pictures of various geological features at an angle rather than when these are directly below the station.

"The images come out in sharper relief, with a distinct border between light and shade. Such photos will soon be supplemented with pictures of the same areas taken by means of a topographical system called Kate-140, which has acquitted itself really well.

"The superposition of the two different kinds of pictures will enable scientists to obtain a lot of new data.

"The crew in the next few days will mount a system called "Korund (Corundum), which is meant to grow crystals. Since it is very power-intensive, more chemical batteries will have to be added to Mir's electric power plant.

"The Taimyr's also had time to operate a Pion-M unit whose name is the Russian acronym for an instrument for investigating the peculiarities of zero gravity."

Commented Professor L. Leskov, who has been overseeing the experiment:

"Whereas the Kristall, Korund and Splav (alloy) plants are used to study the possibility of producing unique metals, alloys and semi-conductor materials in space, the Pion unit makes it possible to monitor the dynamics of these processes in orbit.

"The instrument was developed in 1981, later modernized and then tested on the Salyut-7 space station in September and October 1983 by Vladimir Lyakhov and Aleksandr Aleksandrov.

"It turned out that so-called thermal capillary convection, that is the movement of a liquid under the impact of the surface tension force, manifests itself in weightlessness especially vividly. It interferes with efforts to produce an absolutely uniform material and adversely affects its properties.

"To offset convection, we need to know how and why it happens.

"The model samples in Pion-M are liquids containing hard particles which serve as marks for determining the flow speed. They stay in cells placed between a source of light and a motion-picture or photographic camera and whatever happens in them is recorded on film.

"Another experiment, Kolosok, helps find out how aerosols and hydrosols behave in zero gravity.

"Some of the results are amazing. In the ampoule with the air and particules of fluoroplastic-3, which are the size of a micrometer, for example, these particles banded together in such a way as to make the air pockets under glass look surprisingly like trees.

"And in the ampoules with an aerosol mix of the air and particles of aerosil (a glass variety) there have appeared a kind of 'flying saucers'.

"Some of these formations are unexpectedly strong, so strong in fact they cannot be broken even by a one-gram piece of steel contained in the ampoule.

"I think that these new experiments staged by Taimyr's have moved us into a yet unexplored field of colloidal chemistry."

SOKOLOV ADDRESSES ARMED FORCES WOMEN'S AKTIV

PM081751 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 1 Mar 87 Second Edition p 3

["Our correspondent" report: "Meeting with the Women's Aktiv"]

[Text] A meeting between the USSR Defense Ministry leadership, the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate, and the USSR Armed Forces women's aktiv was held yesterday at the M.V. Frunze Central House of the Soviet Army.

The meeting was opened by Army General A. Lizichev, chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate.

A report was delivered by Yu. Sokolova, senior instructor of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate for work with servicemen's families and member of the Soviet Women's Committee Presidium.

The participants in the meeting shared their experience of work with servicemen's families, work whose intensification is regarded as an important condition of the restructuring which is under way in the Army and the Navy and of military cadres' enhanced efficiency. A frank exchange of views took place on questions pertaining to the living and leisure conditions of servicemen's families.

The meeting participants were addressed by Marshal of the Soviet Union S. Sokolov, USSR defense minister.

The meeting was attended by V. Tereshkova, chairman of the Presidium of the Union of Soviet Societies for Friendship and Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries, and G. Galkina, deputy chairman of the Soviet Women's Committee.

A report on the meeting will be published in one of the next editions of this newspaper.

MARSHAL SHESTOPALOV ATTENDS TURKESTAN MD MEETING

PM081741 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 6 Mar 87 Second Edition p 2

[Report by correspondent Colonel G. Ivanov under the general heading: "In A Businesslike Atmosphere"]

[Text] Red Banner Turkestan Military District -- A district party aktiv meeting has discussed command and political cadres' tasks in carrying out the decisions of the CPSU Central Committee January (1987) Plenum. The report by Colonel General N. Popov, commander of the district's troops, and the speeches by meeting participants stressed the need to promptly tackle urgent cadre matters, ensure leadership continuity and a constant influx of new manpower, and eliminate any underestimation of political and theoretical training and ideological tempering of military cadres.

I. Usmankhodzhayev, first secretary of the Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee; Marshal of Engineering Troops N. Shestopalov, USSR deputy minister of defense for construction and billeting of troops; and Army General M. Zaytsev, attended the meeting.

GENERAL SHABANOV ATTENDS N. CAUCASUS MD CONFERENCE

PM081905 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 3 Mar 87 First Edition p 2

[Own correspondent Lieutenant Colonel A. Borovkov report under the rubric "Komsomol Conferences": "Stepping up Young People's Activeness"]

[Text] The Red Banner North Caucasus Military District Komsomol conferences has been held.

The report by Captain A. Shcherbina, assistant chief of the district political directorate for Komsomol work, and the speeches by Lieutenant General L. Shustko, district commander, Lieutenant General V. Korablev, member of the military council and chief of the district political directorate; Guards Captain V. Koshkin; Senior Sergeant A. Yakubov; and others were devoted to the restructuring of Komsomol work in the light of the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress and the CPSU Central Committee January (1987) Plenum. It was emphasized that it is necessary to make better and more purposeful use of the rich arsenal of the forms and methods of Komsomol influence on young people and to overcome formalism and excessive paper work.

The conference was attended and addressed by Army General V. Shabanov, USSR deputy defense minister.